

<Original Articles>Historical Significance of the Far Eastern Championship Games : An International Political Area

著者	Abe Ikuo
雑誌名	体育科学系紀要
巻	26
ページ	37-68
発行年	2003-03
URL	http://hdl.handle.net/2241/11372

Historical Significance of the Far Eastern Championship Games: An International Political Arena

ABE Ikuo

和文抄録

「極東選手権競技会の歴史的意義に関する一考察：国際政治のアリーナ」

1911年11月に設立されたフィリピン体育協会 (Philippine Amateur Athletic Federation) は、YMCA から派遣されたE. S. ブラウン (E. S. Brown) の指導のもとに1912年に極東オリンピック協会 (Far Eastern Olympic Association) を設立し、極東オリンピック大会 (Far Eastern Olympic Games) を構想し実現させた。マニラ・カーニヴァルの折に開催された第1回マニラ大会 (1913) には、中国が参加し、日本からは野球チームとテニス選手が招待された。しかし、当初、2年おきに開催されたこの競技会に対する日本の姿勢は消極的なものであった。第2回上海大会 (1915) では、日本の中国に対する対華21か条要求は、この大会への日本選手派遣の遅れの原因となった。更に、アジアでの最初のIOC委員であった嘉納治五郎は、この地域大会に「オリンピック」という名称を用いることを好まなかった。第2回上海大会 (1915) から、極東オリンピック協会と極東オリンピック大会の名称は、極東体育協会 (Far Eastern Athletic Association)、極東選手権競技会 (Far Eastern Championship Games) と変更された。以来、極東選手権競技会は様々な深刻な政治問題に当面し、究極的に満州国の参加問題をめぐる日本と中国の対立から第10回マニラ大会 (1934) をもって解消された。この間、IOCは日本と中国との対立を緩和しようと試みたが、その調停工作は失敗に帰した。本研究は、従来、あまり研究の対象とされてこなかった極東選手権競技会の歴史的意義を、その創始の経緯、YMCA と IOC の極東選手権競技会への関与、競技会と参加国の推移、競技種目の推移、極東選手権が日本のアマチュアスポーツ体制に果たした役割、競技会の賞の種類とその象徴的意味、国旗問題、満州国参加問題と極東選手権競技会の解消の経緯から明らかにしようとし

た。本研究では、国際関係のコンテキストから極東選手権競技会の歴史的意義を明らかにするため、IOC 附属オリンピック・ミュージアムに保管されている極東選手権文書 (FECG File)、大日本体育協会文書 (JAAA File)、中華民国体育協会文書 (CNAFA File)、フィリピン体育協会文書 (PAAF File)、YMCA 文書 (YMCA File) を主要な史料として用いた。

本研究では以下のような諸点を明らかにした。
①米西戦争 (1898) に勝利してフィリピンを割譲されたアメリカの極東戦略と連動して、YMCA の E. S. ブラウンの指導の下にフィリピン体育協会が1911年に設立される一方、極東オリンピック競技会を構想する極東オリンピック協会が翌年に立ち上げられた。
②IOCが極東「オリンピック」競技会や極東「オリンピック」協会に付けられた「オリンピック」の名称使用にクレームをつけたことから、E. S. ブラウンはYMCAの“All Sports for All”を促進する一方で、IOCのオリンピックムーブメントを支援する地域競技会を普及してIOCとのパートナーシップを築き上げようとした。
③E. S. ブラウンはそのためにSouth American International Games、Indian Empire Games、Central European Games等の地域競技会構想をIOCのクーベルタン (Pierre de Coubertin) に持ち掛けてそのパトネージを獲得しようとした。極東選手権競技会はYMCAとIOCとのパートナーシップによって促進された地域競技会の最初の成功例であった。
④極東選手権競技会に関与した国は、帝国主義期アジアを反映しており、アメリカ領フィリピン、中国、日本 (台湾、朝鮮、満州国を含む)、シャム、イギリス領インドとセイロン、仏領インドシナ、オランダ領東インドを含むものであり、遥かに「極東」を越える範囲に及ぶものであった。
⑤日本の極東体育協会への加盟と極東選手権競技会への選手派遣は日本のスポーツ統括組織の改組に重要な契機をもたらした。大日本体育協会が極東選

手権競技会への正式な選手派遣団体を表明したのは1917年であったが、第4回大会直前の1919年3月には極東体育協会からの脱退を宣言した。選手派遣の代表権をめぐる長期にわたる混乱と問題は大日本体育協会の改組を不可避のものとした。⑥優勝杯の寄贈は、IOCの影響、極東における日本天皇制の宗主権、そしてまた政治家や名望家や企業家の名誉を象徴するものであった。特に総合優勝国に与えられる天皇杯は、極東選手権競技会の解消時には、その日本への返還が大きな問題となった。⑦第9回東京大会でインドの独立を求めるインド選手は、公認されたインド国旗の代りに民族旗を用いたことから英国、インド、日本とIOCを巻き込む外交問題を惹起した。この事件は、極東選手権競技会における帝国主義宗主国の主権、植民地における民族主義、IOCのスポーツ国際主義の対立図式を象徴していた。⑧競技種目と競技規則は当初YMCAの主導の下になされ野球、バスケットボール、バレーボール等の非オリンピック種目が重視された。しかし陸上競技に典型的に現れたように、国際競技会のルールに適合させようとする力学が日本を中心にして生じ始めた。実施された競技種目は選手権種目としての陸上競技、水泳競技、野球、テニス、蹴球、バスケットボール、バレーボールに加え、オープン競技種目として自転車競技、ラグビー、卓球、軟式テニス、ホッケー、ボクシング、体操、射撃があった。また女子はオープン競技種目のみの参加であったが、種目には陸上競技、水泳競技、テニス、バスケットボール、バレーボール、軟式テニスがかった。総じて競技種目の決定と競技規則の改訂は各国の利害を反映していた。⑨日本の傀儡国家満州国が成立した直後の1932年4月に満州国体育協会(Manchoukuo Amateur Athletic Association)が設立され、ロサンゼルスオリンピック組織委員会(Los Angeles Organizing Committee the Xth Olympic Games)にオリンピック参加を申し込み、一方でIOCへの加盟を求めたが、そうした申請を認めることが満州国の国際的認知を正当化することから、両者共に満州国体育協会の申請の認可を拒絶した。⑩満州国体育協会は日本の陸軍戸山学校教官や青年将校や右翼に働きかけ、大日本体育協会に満州国の第10回極東選手権競技会マニラ大会(1934)への参加を実現するように働きかけた。この間、満州国の参加問題は、政治問題と切

り離してスポーツマンの信義、スポーツマンシップの精神性という非政治的政治性によって議論された。満州国のスポーツマンシップを論拠にした性急で強硬な参加要求に対して、同じスポーツマンシップを盾にして大日本体育協会は満州国の参加を展望しつつも必ずしも同調しなかった。⑪マニラ大会の定時総会で満州国の参加を絶対的に拒否する中国が、極東体育協会憲法の第3条に規定されている新たな参加国の承認には全会一致を要するという条項を盾に日本と対立した。中国は自国の極東体育協会からの退会を認めず、次の上海大会を準備する旨を伝えて会議を退席した。この間、フィリピン体育協会は両者の立場の間を揺れ動き、究極的に日本の主張する構成国を拡大した東洋体育協会(Amateur Athletic Association of the Orient)の立ち上げに同意した。⑫IOC会長ラツール(Count de Baillet-Latour)はフィリピン体育協会に極東体育協会の解散を確認した上で、新たに設立された東洋体育協会に中国が加盟するようベルリンオリンピック大会の折に「スポーツマン的公平」(sportsmanlike impartiality)でもって説得することを約束した。

このように、極東選手権競技会はアメリカの極東戦略と連繋したYMCAの「全てのスポーツを全ての者に」という非政治的政治性によって構想された地域競技会(regional games)によって立ち上げられ、IOCのスポーツの国際主義とパトロネージを盾に歩みだしたのであった。その競技会は、日本、中国、フィリピンの三国を中心しつつも、アメリカ、フランス、オランダ、イギリス等の枢軸国とそれらの隷属国の利害関係を背景に、アジアの宥和と平和を求めようとするものであったが、満州国参加の承認をめぐる日中の外交的、政治的対立を「スポーツマンシップ」や「スポーツの公正」によって克服することができず解消されたのであった。極東選手権競技会は、その成立から終焉にかけて極東諸国におけるアマチュアスポーツの普及とその体制の整備を進展させ、スポーツマンシップの理念を普及したが、スポーツマンの非政治的政治性の外交によっては国際政治の深刻な対立を解決することができないという限界性の中で解消されたのであった。しかし、同時に、そうした深刻な対立の下でも、極東のスポーツマンの間に、スポーツによる平和主義とスポーツマンシップの内包する人間的理想主義が、

常識として広くかつ深く浸透したのも事実であった。極東選手権競技会の歴史的意義は、その意味で複合的なものであった。

Introduction

Kyokuto Senshukun Kyogikai [the Far Eastern Championship Games (FECG)], whose regular participating nations were the Philippine Islands, China, and Japan, originated in 1913 under the initiative of the YMCA and ended in 1934 due to political confrontation between Japan and China over the Manchukuo problem. The Games as a whole have scarcely drawn serious attention from sports historians. This study analyzes the historical significance and character of the Games, which were the earliest international games with the exception of the Olympics. It was also the first regional games in the world. Because the creation, evolution and termination of the FECG were political, this study focuses on the political interventions of the YMCA and the IOC in promoting the FECG as well as the political interaction between respective countries participated the Games. It also takes notice of the relationship between the global sports policies of YMCA and IOC and the formation of the modern/amateur sports regime in the respective countries, especially in Japan. The files of correspondence and documents preserved in the Olympic Museum in Lausanne, such as FECG File, CNAFA File, PAAA File, JAAA File and YMCA File were fully utilized in order to reconsider the historical significance of the Games.

The Far Eastern Games were analyzed from the following aspects:

1. Origin: YMCA and the creation of the first regional games,
2. FEAA and IOC: A partnership for sports hegemony,
3. Membership and participation: Asian powers in microcosm and the unification of amateur sports regime in Japan,
4. Sports, events and rules: the arena of national prides,
5. Trophies and flags: symbols of political power and nationalism,
6. The Termination: dissolution of FEAA and the

reconciliatory intervention of IOC,

7. Manchoukuo's participation to FECG: issues and dispute,
8. Dissolution of FEAA and the end of FECG: the intervention of IOC's sportsmanlike politics.

Origin: YMCA and the Creation of the First Regional Games

The report of the 10th Far Eastern Championship Games published in 1934 recorded the beginning of the Games with a touch of a sentiment of Japanism:

The development of both the Far Eastern Athletic Association and the Far Eastern Championship Games resides in extension and development of the Philippine Amateur Athletic Federation. America's colonialist policy has been expanding over the Philippine Islands, with the funeral march for colonialist Spain and America's inclusion of the Islands as a part of her political geography.... American leaders adopted a cultural policy to make the Games authoritative among the Far East, and aimed the Islands to hold the sovereignty in the region.¹

Despite the Japanese sentimentalism in these lines, they are not far off the point. In reality, creation of the Games had a strong connection with the establishment of a new sports system in the Philippine Islands, which were under the U.S. regime. The Islands were ceded to the United States as an outcome of the Spanish-American War in 1898. This gave rise to anti-American sentiments, as a result of which the Philippines independence movement began, similar to the rebellion against Spanish colonialism. In May 1902, General Malvar, the most enduring of the Filipino generals, made peace with America. With the end of the war, the first governor general came to the Philippines and a new cultural policy was initiated.² W. Cameron Forbes, the third governor general of the Philippines, probably welcomed Elwood S. Brown's arrival in Manila. E.S. Brown, the talented physical director of the YMCA, devoted his early years in the Philippines to do extension work among the Filipinos and consulting work for the Bureau of

Education.³ He was privileged to serve for almost a decade.

The Philippine Amateur Athletic Federation (PAAF) was established in Manila in November 1911 with the aim of protecting amateur athletics.⁴ It was an antidote to the proliferation of “shamateurism” in the Islands. In cooperation with W.C. Forbes, E.S. Brown worked devotedly toward the policy of improving the state and standard of amateur sports in the country. This partnership led to the idea of organizing a championship for the people of the Orient, and in the summer of 1912, the Far Eastern Olympic Association (FEOA) was founded. E.S. Brown was so devoted to the organization that the official report of the Sixth FECS dedicated a eulogy to him.

The Far Eastern Athletic Association started as a big idea in the minds of two or three Americans in Manila in the summer of 1912, and has already become a big thing in the lives of hundreds of millions of Orientals, and registers the highwater mark of progress in international athletics in over two decades. It was the outgrowth of the Philippine Amateur Athletic Federation, which in a few years has transformed the Islands into a great playground. The driving power behind this entire movement was Mr. Elwood S. Brown.⁵

The initial plan of the FEOG was to cover such areas as Philippine Islands, Northern China, Southern China, Japan, Malaya, and Siam, and include such sports and events as athletics, swimming, baseball, football, basketball, and volleyball.⁶ The aim of the Games is clearly shown in William Tutherly's *The World at Play*:

The association started out with a few fundamental ideas, to which it owes a large measure of its success, some of which mark a departure from the generally accepted idea of athletics. The popular mind has heretofore regarded athletics as something belonging to children and the leisure classes. On the contrary, the great object is to *popularize sport, bring it within the reach of everybody, and thereby raise the athletic average of the*

community at large. If millions of people are at play and taking rational exercise, stars will emerge from the multitude and shine at Olympic contests. Breaking records is a secondary consideration. Long before the star rises millions will have become better prepared for the work of life. Acting on this theory the association seeks to stimulate the athletic spirit at large, promote wholesome community activities, establish standards of competition, develop local organisations and combine them into national associations and to coordinate all athletic interests within its territory. It also conducts the Far Eastern Championship Games at stated intervals, largely as a measure of publicity, calculated to popularise sport, and to develop the athletic spirit and a feeling of fraternity and goodwill between the peoples of the Orient. Once the conduct is established, the transition from the spirit of rivalry to one of fraternity is simple. It seems well worthwhile that these Oriental millions become aroused to a realisation of their athletic possibilities, both from the standpoint of general physical development and individual competition, and place themselves on a footing of athletic equality with the rest of the world.⁷

Beyond YMCA Protestantism and its denomination, an idealism of “athletic spirit” was generated, which could convey to the Orient the popularization of sports, aspiration of individuals, construction of a healthy community, fraternity, and goodwill. This idealism effectively and quickly spread into the Far East.

Meanwhile, when the FEAA sent an invitation letter for their First Games at Manila in 1913 to another newly founded governing body, the *Dainihon Taiiku Kyokai* [the Japan Amateur Athletic Association (JAAA)], Japan had already sent its athletes for the first time to the Fifth Olympic Games at Stockholm in 1912. The first announcement of the Far Eastern Olympic Games was sent to the JAAA via a proxy of the Japanese consul in Manila on August 23, 1912. Dr. Jigoro Kano, president of the JAAA and the first Asian

IOC member, was visiting European countries after the Stockholm Olympics. However, when he heard of the invitation, he reacted negatively both to taking part in the FEOG and to becoming a member of the FEOA. His negative attitude was because of his view that it would be no use organizing another Olympic Games and establishing associations similar to the IOC in the Far East.⁸ The first problem that the Games faced was related to using the word *Olympic*.

FEOA (FEAA) and IOC: A Partnership for Sports Hegemony

Issue over using the word Olympic

The Far Eastern Olympic Association organized the First Games in Manila in 1913 under the name of the Far Eastern Olympic Games. However, by the Second Games held in Shanghai, both the association and the Games were renamed as the Far Eastern Athletic Association and the Far Eastern Championship Games, respectively. Although it is not certain how these changes occurred between the First and the Second Games, there must have been a warning from the IOC against using the word *Olympic*, which might have originated from Dr. Kano's antipathy. In a letter dated September 30, 1914, from H. Brent, president of the PAAF, to Pierre de Coubertin, in which the organization was referred to as the "Far Eastern Athletic Association."⁹ It is probable that the deletion of the word *Olympic* from both the association and its games happened about this time. As F.H. Brown reported, the initial relationship between IOC the and FEAA was not very strong:

It is inconceivable that two such organizations as the International Olympic Committee and the Far Eastern Athletic Association should long exist without establishing a close fraternal relationship. The general aims are identical and the same means are used for their accomplishment. The field of the Olympic Committee is the world. There is, however, a great lack of equality in many parts of the world in the matter of opportunity for athletic development and the

realization of the slogans "All Sports for All" and "Play for Everybody." Therefore, the Olympic idea needs to function in certain sections through developmental agencies such as the FEAA, provided these agencies uphold the highest amateur standards and have as their real aim the raising of the general athletic average, the development of star performers being merely incidental. The younger body is really a child of the IOC, though not at first acknowledged as such by the parent. The FEAA was consciously patterned after the Olympic Committee in many respects, the program of the Championship Games followed the Olympic Games so far as the undeveloped athletic conditions in the Orient permitted, and the Games were scheduled in the odd years in order that there never would be a conflict with the Olympic dates. The original name was "The Far Eastern Olympic Association," but a request from the IOC that the word "Olympic" not be used met with prompt compliance and present name was adopted.¹⁰

Partnership between the YMCA and the IOC: Policy for Regional Games

On the part of the FEAA, the "prompt compliance" to disuse the word *Olympic* drew gradual attention of the IOC to the Far Eastern Championship Games. E.S. Brown began to communicate frequently with the IOC, mainly with three American IOC members.¹¹ Although a rigid partnership with IOC had not yet been established, he had a grand plan to extend YMCA's "All Sports for All" policy worldwide by creating regional games under the auspices of the IOC. The FEFG was the first of the regional games he planned and it was an excellent precedent for the other games he wanted to implement. Until his death in 1924, he devoted almost his entire life to organizing regional games. He continued his work in the Philippines until 1918, when he was called to serve in the European theater as a wartime physical director with American troops.¹² Friction between E.S. Brown and Baron de Coubertin occurred soon after World War I. E.S. Brown was

one of the influential masterminds of the Inter-Allied Athletic Games held in Paris from June 22 to July 6 in 1919. Baron de Coubertin claimed him again the disuse of the word *Olympic*, which had been so frequently misused by the press and newspapers when referring to the Games.¹³ However, this friction never broke their loose partnership, because E.S. Brown was a talented informant for Baron de Coubertin. On January 2, 1920, he proposed the idea of an Indian European Games, which was to be based on the following principles: (1) The "All Sports for All" idea in continuous operation and underlying the entire plan, (2) the annual provincial championships based on Olympic events, and (3) the biennial Indian Empire Games as the regional or developmental unit of the Olympic movement.¹⁴ In another letter dated February 2, 1920, he requested Coubertin to give him a favorable chance to report before the IOC members during the Olympic Congress at Antwerp in 1920 regarding the regional games he had planned. These included the Far Eastern Championship Games, the South American International Games, and the Indian Empire Games.¹⁵ In the congress, he appealed the following six points:

(1) Officially recognize and encourage as development agencies the Far Eastern Games, the proposed South American International Games, the Indian Empire Games, and any similar projects that may be organized by YMCA or any other reputable agency, with previous knowledge of the International Olympic Committee, in any part of the world not fully reached by the International Olympic Committee. (In other words, take some definite action whereby these sectional games will not be simply commenced but will be henceforth officially be considered as a specific part of the International Committee world's campaign to promote "All Sports for All.") (2) Supply these sectional organizations with all pertinent material and information regarding action taken from time to time by the International Olympic Committee and invite them to send official representatives to the various Olympic

congresses. (3) Appoint a member from each country not already represented on the Committee whenever athletic conditions in such countries justify this appointment. (4) Invite countries which are not represented on the International Olympic Committee and have never sent an athlete to the Olympic Games to send one or more observers to the 1924 Games. (5) Notify the YMCA in what manner and to what extent its physical directors around the world can best serve your Committee. (6) Appoint an official representative of International Olympic Committee to sectional games in various parts of the world as an observer, advisor and as visible sign of recognition and adoption.¹⁶

After the congress, E.S. Brown traveled around Czechoslovakia, Romania, Turkey, Greece, and Italy. He aspired to organize "for the 1923 original development games, which might be called Middle European International games, or Eastern European International games, with Czechoslovakia, Romania and Greece as certain participants and Yugoslavia, Bulgaria, and Hungary as potential members."¹⁷ Whereas E.S. Brown's projects grew gigantic, Baron de Coubertin's interest in the regional games remained limited. With a partially acquired partnership, E.S. Brown hastened to draw IOC's consistent and full commitment to these games. In a memorandum attached to his letter to Baron de Coubertin on June 1, 1921, E.S. Brown requested IOC's official approval of the games and its full sympathy with his or YMCA's work:

(1) The International Olympic Committee recognizes as an integral part of the Olympic movement the Far Eastern Championship Games, the forthcoming South American International Games and the proposed Indian Empire Games, organized by the Young Men's Christian Association, and regards these Games as development agencies in the various regions of the globe mentioned. This status is to exist so long as Olympic amateur standards and other fundamental bases are observed. The Committee shall be sole judge in this matter and reserves the right to modify or annul this

relationship at any time. No additional regional Games which may be projected shall be regarded as coming within this relationship unless organized with previous knowledge and consent of the Committee.... (5) The International Committee commends, and is in full sympathy with, the play-for-everybody program of the YMCA throughout the world and will avail itself of the proffered cooperation of the physical directors of that organization whenever and wherever Olympic work may justify. The Committee believes that the technical cooperation of these physical directors should be utilized in the promotion, organization and operation of the development of the Games heretofore mentioned. (6) Affirmative action: suggested that Baron de Coubertin be appointed to attend the South American International Games in 1922, and Dr. Jigoro Kano to the Far Eastern Championship Games in 1921.¹⁸

E.S. Brown's ambitious plans for regional games may have attracted Coubertin and his international politics to increase the number of countries involved in the Olympic Games and the Olympic movement.¹⁹ His idealism toward international athleticism might have been equivalent to Pierre de Coubertin's. However, he eventually failed to establish a permanent and full partnership with the IOC due to his early death at the age of forty.²⁰ His ambitious, fraternal, amicable, and international dream of regional games remained mostly unachieved, except for the Far Eastern Championship Games, which continued till the Tenth Games in 1934, compared with the South American Games, which took place only once. He would never have dreamt of the FECG ending because of a fierce political struggle between China and Japan. However, it is praiseworthy that his idealism helped to realize a partnership between the IOC and the YMCA, which brought hegemony of the "sportsmanship" movement as well as the "play movement" to nations worldwide.

Membership and Participants: Asian powers in microcosm and the unification of amateur sports regime in Japan

Usually, in the FECG, the tripartite nations—the Philippine Islands, China, and Japan—challenged one another. However, in reality, 15 or more countries and regions had some relation with the FECG. Taiwan and Korea had been already annexed to Japan before they made their entry to the Games. After the First Games in Manila in 1913, E.S. Brown visited Malaya and Siam, and was successful in persuading these countries to participate in the Second Games in Shanghai in 1915, although they had to abandon their participation due to the possibility of an attack from Germany during World War I. He also visited Dutch Java in 1920 to invite it to the Games. At the congress of the Fifth Games in Shanghai in 1921, a decision was made to send invitation letters to Malaya, India, and Ceylon, all of which were colonies of the British Empire. In the Seventh Games in Manila in 1925, participation of India was seriously discussed during the congress. Again, at the congress of the Eighth Games in Shanghai in 1927, the FEAA requested India to be an official member, and sent an invitation letter to Siam as well. For the Ninth Games in Tokyo in 1930, invitation letters were sent to India, Siam, Java, and French Indies, and India's involvement in the Games was finalized without British approval. During the Tenth Games in Manila in 1934, both Dutch West-Indies and French Indies were approved officially as member countries, although the Games in Manila were the last and the FEAA was dissolved due to the serious political problem of Manchukuo. In the age of imperialism, the realm of the countries that participated in the FECG, including states, puppet countries, colonies, and suzerains, extended far beyond the Far East.

Japan's commitment to the FEAA was rather ambiguous in the early periods (Table 1). E.S. Brown visited the JAAA several times in order to persuade Japan to become an official member of the FEAA, but in vain. It was not until 1917 that Japan became an official member. The attitude of the JAAA toward the FEAA and FECG was very

indecisive. JAAA did not send athletes to the First Games in Manila. As a result of E.S. Brown's persuasion, the Osaka Mainichi News Company sent the first Japanese team to the Games. Just before the Second Games at Shanghai, the Japanese government declared the Twenty-One Demands to China in January 1915. The JAAA had maintained its negative attitude toward the Games for the fear of serious political and diplomatic frictions. In the Second Games in Shanghai in 1915, besides reducing the number of athletes, plural bodies, such as the Osaka Mainichi News Company, JAAA, and the Japanese concession in Shanghai, sent their athletes. The JAAA was by no means the representative body that sent the Japanese team for the FECG. At the congress after the Games in Shanghai, some of the Japanese residents and delegates made tentative suggestions for the Third Games to be held in Tokyo in 1917. Withholding official membership of the FEAA, the JAAA officially accepted the proposal to hold the FECG in Tokyo, on the condition that FECG rules are revised according to the Japanese wishes. The Third Games in Tokyo became the first international games organized in Japan.

However, immediately before the Fourth Games in Shanghai, on March 17, 1919, JAAA suddenly declared its withdrawal from the FEAA. The ostensible reason was that holding the Games in the month of May would hinder the studies of Japanese students. In reality, the withdrawal was the product of complex reasons: (1) Fearing disputes between China and Japan, the Ministries of Education and of Foreign Affairs did not want the JAAA to send Japanese athletes to the Games; (2) Dr. Kano insisted on the priority of Olympic Games over the FECG; (3) JAAA had already made preparations for sending athletes to the Olympic Games in Antwerp in 1920; and (4) Japan faced serious financial problems due to World War I.²¹ Political factors also contributed to the JAAA decision to countermand the contract of membership to the FEAA which had been agreed upon in 1917. These included the emergence of a communist Russia after the revolution in 1917 and her decision to send military forces to Siberia in August 1918;

the breakout of the Korean independence movement symbolized by the First of March movement in 1919; and the Chinese launch of a protest movement against Japan's military invasion to Shandong, which caused the Fourth of May movement in 1919.

The cancellation by the JAAA aroused strong criticism in Japan. Even within the JAAA, many of the staff criticized this action. The Kansai branch of the JAAA decided to send its own athletic team to the Fourth Games in Manila, and informed the FEAA of its intention to participate. However, the FEAA only approved its entry to the open events. The Kansai branch and some staff members of the JAAA sought to resolve this conflict among themselves, and reached a provisional compromise to "set up the *Nihon Undo Seinen Club* [the Japan Athletic Youth Club (JAYC)] provisionally and voluntarily" in order to send Japanese athletes to Manila.²² From his moralistic and dedicated position, Chiyosaburo Takeda, who was the president of the club and vice-president of the JAAA, sent 16 athletes to the Games by gathering financial support from newspaper companies and the corporate world in the Kansai region. At the congress of the Games in Manila, the tripartite nations agreed that the next Games would be held at Shanghai in October 1921, and the Japanese representative body should be the JAYC.²³ This agreement, however, caused a further confrontation between the JAAA and JAYC. The JAAA appealed that as the JAYC had been a provisional body, the JAAA should have the right to send the Japanese team to the next Games at Shanghai. On January 30, 1921, the JAAA and JAYC had a meeting and reached a compromise. They decided on the following: (1) The athletes would be sent under the name of a third party, the Japan Contest Committee for 1921, (2) the Sixth Games would be held in Osaka, but after that the JAAA would be responsible for every negotiation with the FECG, and (3) in case Japan hosted the FECG, the venue would be Tokyo and Osaka alternately.²⁴ Concomitant with this resolution, Chiyosaburo Takeda dissolved the JAYC, and resigned from its presidency as well as from the vice-presidency of the JAAA. At the same

Table 1. NUMBER OF ATHLETES PARTICIPATING IN THE FAR EASTERN CHAMPIONSHIP GAMES

(July 7, 2002, by IABE)

			Track & Field(1)	Swimming	Football	Basketball	Volleyball	Baseball	Tennis	Bycycling	Table Tennis	Boxing	Total
1913	1. Manila	Philippine											120
		China											50
		Japan	2	0	0	0	0	14	0	0			16
1915	2. Shanghai	Philippine											?
		China											?
		Japan	8	1	0	0	0	0	2	0			11
1917	3. Tokyo	Philippine											103
		China											91
		Japan	58	32	16	8	19	14	4	3			154
1919	4. Manila	Philippine											?
		China											?
		Japan	12	4	0	0	0	0	3				19
1921	5. Shanghai	Philippine											140
		China											113
		Japan	46	15	13	11	(11)*	12	5				102
1923	6. Osaka	Philippine											143
		China											103
		Japan	78	39	12	12	12	23	7				183
1925	7. Manila	Philippine											175
		China											120
		Japan	51	25	16	10	14	18	6(2)				140(2)
1927	8. Shanghai	Philippine	62	9	22	15	22	15	4				149
		China	59	23	20	10	35(21)	19	4		7		177
		Japan	57	28	17	12	28(15)	20	5		7		174(15)
1930	9. Tokyo	Philippine	35	14	15	12	24(12)	15	6(3)			6	127
		China	28	6	15	12	26(14)	16	4(2)			0	107
		Japan	71	30	15	10	12	16	10(4)			27	191(4)
		India	3										3
1934	10. Manila	Philippine	48	19	15	12	12	20	4			15	145
		China	28	2	12	12	9	17	2				82
		Japan	42	22	17	12	13	18	4			4	132
		Dutch East Indies	7	2	14				3				23

() : Female athletes

* : Tokyo YMCA Team

(The Seventh Fareastern Championship Games. Report. Published by JAAA, 1925
Dainippon Taiiku Kyokai Shi. Published by JAAA, 1937)

time, the resignation of Dr. Jigoro Kano as president of the JAAA was became inevitable. Thus, the contest committee for 1921 was set up under the presidency of Dr. Tosaku Kinoshita. On March 8, the councilors' meeting of the JAAA was held in Tokyo, and Dr. Kano's resignation from the presidency of the JAAA, as well as the new presidency of Dr. Seiichi Kishi were announced. This was only the beginning of the reorganization of the JAAA.

The contest committee for 1921 sent 110 athletes to the Fifth Games in Shanghai. From these Games, the IOC officially patronized the FECG and sent a representative. The first representative from the IOC was Dr. Kano. In Shanghai, a cold reception awaited him. He wrote to Baron de Coubertin that China and the Philippines did not understand what a representative of IOC was.²⁵ Regardless of the reception he received, as a representative of the IOC at the congress of the Games, Dr. Kano appealed for cooperation between the IOC and FECG, and the promotion of international standardization of the FECG.²⁶ However, the cold reception given to Dr. Kano sparked a scheming, political maneuver from the IOC and E.S. Brown. They selected a new IOC member from China in order to reconcile the cold relationship between China and Japan.²⁷

The Sixth Games in Osaka in 1923 was the heyday of the FECG. The JAAA was successful in making the Games a great national event. All kinds of symbols were shown off at their best in the Sixth Games. Emperor Taisho presented a silver cup to the general championship for the FECG and His Imperial Majesty Prince Chichibu was the chief patron. Japan's emperor system functioned fully to mobilize nationalism and to justify Japanese imperialism. Dr. C.T. Wang, the new IOC member of China, was expected to attend the Games, but he called off the invitation to Osaka because of diplomatic negotiations with Russia.²⁸ Dr. Kano again became the invited representative of the IOC.

Although the Sixth Games at Osaka were concluded successfully, there was a second wave of voices urging reorganization of the JAAA. The confrontation between the Kansai branch and the JAAA continued, and new governing bodies for

individual sports began to emerge. JAAA had to be reorganized as a superior governing body, controlling all governing bodies of individual sports. On April 23, 1924, there was a fierce protest movement against the method of selecting and sending athletes to the Eighth Olympiad in Paris in 1924, mainly from student-athletes of 13 schools, colleges, and universities. This movement was generally known as "*Jusanko Mondai*." The detail of this topic exceeds our immediate concern. However, the protest accelerated the reorganization of the JAAA, which had mainly controlled athletics and swimming. The JAAA decided to approve the founding of new governing bodies for athletics and swimming, and to give itself the role of the general controlling and governing body with the status of an incorporated foundation for individual sports. The JAAA applied to the Ministry of Education and to the Ministry of the Interior for the status of incorporation on March 24, 1925, which was granted on August 8, 1927.

As regards the FECG, a protest against the JAAA, which was somewhat similar to *Jusanko Mondai*, arose during the Seventh Games in Manila in 1925, when some of the athletes of track and field were expelled from the JAAA. The Japanese track and field team protested against a misjudgment in the finals of the 400-meter run, and enforced *Exeunt omnes*. During the Games, officers of the JAAA persuaded the team to resume competing, but in vein. On May 22, the officers declared the dismissal of 12 athletes and a director.²⁹ This dispute was to hereafter lead to a serious confrontation in the reorganization of the JAAA.

Sports, Events, and Rules: The Arena of National Prides

Sports and events in the Far Eastern Championship Games were chosen under the leadership of the YMCA. Regular sports that constituted the championships were track and field, swimming, baseball, tennis, association football, basketball, and volleyball. The choice of sports and events and the adoption of rules could become a power struggle between countries. In the Second Games in Shanghai in 1915, Japan protested that "the rules and regulation

for the Games were drawn up by Americans; moreover, they employ the Games as the propaganda of Christianity.”³⁰ Japan was discontent with the adoption of the Anglo-American yard system, because Japan had already used the metric system at the Fifth Olympiad in Stockholm. After the Second Games in Shanghai, Japan demanded the adoption of the metric system for the FECG. In a letter to Baron de Coubertin dated March 10, 1916, E.S. Brown asked for the official rules and wrote: “The Far Eastern Athletic Association has decided to use in its next Games the track and field rules recently adopted by the International Olympic Committee.”³¹ Japan pressed the FEAA again at the Congress of the Third Games in Tokyo in 1917 to revise the rules and choice of sports. Japanese claims were as follows. (1) One country’s specialty, such as football, basketball or volleyball, should be in the open program. (2) If such sports are included in the general championship, sports special to Japan, such as *Judo* and *Budo* should also be adopted. (3) The general championship system should be abolished, and track and field, swimming, baseball, tennis and marathon should constitute separate championships.³² It seems that by claiming the adoption of nationally favored sports, Japan was contending with YMCA’s leadership and hegemony in the FECG. The Japanese attitude was inconsistent in terms of her priority to the Olympic Games, her persistence of nationalism, and her defiance toward YMCA’s authority.

Japan’s demands were totally ignored at the Fourth Games in Manila in 1919. Football, basketball, and volleyball were included in the general championship; furthermore, singles and doubles tournaments in tennis were given the same status. Japan often criticized the referee system and the management of the games, most of which were controlled by the Americans. It was not until the Fifth Games in Shanghai in 1921 that the FEAA was reorganized by the foundation of the committees for constitution, regulations, the definition of amateurism, and the like. At the congress after the Games, Dr. Kano, as a representative of the IOC, appealed to the members of the FEAA to adopt the

metric system, to make sports and events of the FECG consistent with those of the Olympic Games, and to involve Asian countries in the Olympics.³³ He insisted on the control of the IOC over the FECG.

The Philippines demanded the adoption of women’s tennis and baseball for the exhibition program in the Sixth Games in Osaka, but China and Japan rejected the latter because this women’s sport was not common in either country. Japan demanded women’s swimming as an exhibition sport, which was adopted. Miss Bargar of the Chinese YMCA insisted that women’s volleyball be an exhibition sport, and her claim was approved.³⁴ In general, the Sixth Games were epoch-making so far as women’s sports were concerned, although only as exhibition sports. The Sixth Games also introduced the international code of rules for track and field, swimming, tennis, baseball, football, and basketball. The only exception was volleyball, for which the Far Eastern rules drafted by the contest committee of the FECG were adopted. Meanwhile, the metric system that Japan had clamored for from the beginning was approved for use in the next Games at Manila.

By the Seventh Games in Manila in 1917, a variety of reforms had been discussed: these included establishing the constitution of the FEAA; adopting the amateur regulations of the International Sports Federation; adapting the Olympic scoring system to the present pentathlon event; introducing the two-match system in the league series of baseball, basketball, and volleyball; adopting the Davis Cup system in tennis; and introducing the Emperor’s Cup. At the congress after the disputed Seventh Games, the regulations for the Eighth Games in Shanghai were discussed and approved as follows:

1. The Eighth Games and the Ninth Games shall be held in 1927 and in 1930, respectively, and in order that FECG coexist with the Olympic Games, henceforth the Games shall be held at four-year intervals in-between the Olympic Games.
2. Revision of the rules of track and field
 - a. Track and field sports shall be divided into two

- championships: individual and team
- b. Fixing of regular events
- c. Management in case of the absence of a country in the relay
- d. Limitation of the number of athletes
- e. Position of the start line
- f. Position of the jumping-board of broad jump and triple jump
- g. Ring of throwing the discus
- 3. Revision of the rules of swimming
 - a. Fixing of events
 - b. Limitation of the number of athletes
 - c. Width of swimming lanes
- 4. Decrease in the number of players and reduction of the size of the court in volleyball
- 5. Adoption of the Davis Cup system in tennis
- 6. Limitation of the entry number of athletes and players as follows: baseball, 15; tennis, 6; football, 11; basketball, 10; volleyball, 12.³⁵

In the Eighth Games, table tennis was introduced as an open match due to Japanese demands, but hockey was not.

The meeting after the Eighth Games in Shanghai discussed the following issues: send a formal invitation to India and Siam to participating in the FECG; discuss the nationalities of athletes, standardization of sporting equipment, establishment of a rule committee comprising of a representative from each of the three countries; limit the entry number of players in baseball (17), football (15), volleyball (12), basketball (10), and tennis (4).³⁶ Table tennis was not played in the Ninth Games in Tokyo in 1930, and instead, hockey was adopted as an exhibition sport. Boxing was also included as an invitation tournament in the Games, besides demonstration programs such as gymnastics, mass games, soft tennis, and *suijutsu* (Japan's traditional swimming). In the Tenth Games in Manila in 1934, the local rules, known as the Far Eastern rules, had nearly become extinct because of the introduction of international rules for all sports. Track and field events were organized into three championships: field, track, and general. According to this revision, there were nine Championship Games: besides the three championships in track and field, there were

championships for swimming, baseball, basketball, volleyball, football, and tennis. In the open matches, boxing and shooting were introduced, in which China and the Philippine participated (Table 2).

In general, the influence of the YMCA on sports in countries that participated in the FECG was enormous. Modernization of sports in the Philippines was a typical example. In China, the first National Championship Games held in 1910 included four sports: athletics, association football, tennis, and basketball. In the second National Championship Games, by adding baseball and volleyball, these games nearly became the microcosm of the FECG. In Japan, Hyozou Omori, a graduate of Springfield College of the YMCA, introduced basketball in 1907, and F. H. Brown, the YMCA physical director in Japan, introduced volleyball in 1915. Both sports became popular in parallel with the development of the FECG and diffused into Japanese educational institutions. The historical role that the FECG had played under the leadership of the YMCA was at the least, a powerful driving force in promoting modernization and organization of sports in Far Eastern countries, most of which, except Japan, had never participated in the Olympic Games until the late 1920s.³⁷

Trophies and Flags: Symbols of Political Power and Nationalism

Trophies symbolize national, cultural, political, and commercial powers. Trophies of the FECG were basically categorized into permanent trophies for each championship and the three-leg trophies for each event, their forms being diverse, such as silver cups, silver shields, silver bowls, silver statutes, gold laurel wreaths, bronze shields, bronze sculptures, bronze vases, and Chinese scrolls. Trophies were donated by various persons, including the governor general, IOC members, the Emperor of Japan, premiers, presidents, and ministers of the states, mayors, administrators and politicians, commercial and news companies, *zaibatus* (financial combines), and honorable persons in associations and institutions of sports (Table 3). At first, the people who were connected to the PAAF and the American regime in the

Table 2. SPORTS AND EVENTS OF THE FAR EASTERN CHAMPIONSHIP GAMES (1913-1934)

		(JULY 7, 2002, by IABE)									
		1 Mania	2 Shanghai	3 Tokyo	4 Manila	5 Shanghai	6 Osaka	7 Manila	8 Shanghai	9 Tokyo	10 Manila
		1913(T2)	1915(T4)	1917(T8)	1919(T8)	1921(T10)	1923(T12)	1925(T14)	1927(S2)	1930(S5)	1934(S9)
Championships	Sports	Events	31/1-9/2	15/5-19/5	8/5-12/5	10/5-16/5	30/5-4/6	21/5-26/5	18/5-22/5	27/8-5/9	24/5-31/5
	Track & Field	100 Yard	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(100m)	○	○(Track)
		220 Yard	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(200m)	○	○(Track)
		440 Yard	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(400m)	○	○(Track)
		880 Yard	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(800m)	○	○(Track)
		1 Mile Race	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(1500m)	○	○(Track)
		Marathon	○(5Mile)	○(8Mile)	○(10Mile)	○(5Mile)	○(25Mile)	○	○	○	○
		120 Yard High Hurdle R	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(110m)	○	○(Track)
		220 Yard Low Hurdle R	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(200m)	○	○
		Half Mile Relay	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(800m)	○	○
		1 Mile Relay	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(1600m)	○	○(Team)
		High Jump	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(Field)
		Standing High Jump	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		Long Jump	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(Field)
		Standing Long Jump	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		Pole Vault	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(Field)
		Shot-put	○	○	○(18lb.)	○	○(12lb.)	○(12lb.)	○(12lb.)	○(12lb.)	○(5.442kg)
		Discus	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(Field)
		Pentathlon	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		Decathlon	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		Javelin	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(Field)
		5 Mile Race	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		Triple Jump	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(Field)
		10000m Race	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(Track)
		400m Hurdle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(Track)
	Swimming	40 Yard Freestyle	○	○(50Yard)	○	○	○	○	○(50m)	○	○
		100 Yard Freestyle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(100m)	○	○
		220 Yard Freestyle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(400m)	○	○
		440 Yard Freestyle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		1 Mile Freestyle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(1500m)	○	○
		100 Yard Backstroke	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(100m)	○	○
		220 Yard Breaststroke	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(200m)	○	○
		180 Yard Relay	○	○(200Yard)	○	○	○	○	○(200m)	○	○
		Diving	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		880 Yard Freestyle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		800m Relay	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Baseball	Baseball	○(J.P.)	○(P.)*	○(J.P.)	○(P)**	○(P.J.C.)	○(P.J.C.)	○(P.J.C.)	○(J.C.P.)	○(J.C.P.)
		Indoor Baseball(Female)	○	○(P)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Tennis	Singles	○(P)*	○(J)	○(J)	○(P)	○	○	○	○	○
		Doubles	○(P)*	○(J)	○(J)	○(P)	○	○	○	○	○
	Football		○(P.C)	○(C.P)	○(C.P.J)	○(C.P)	○(C.P.J)	○(C.P.J)	○(J.P.C)	○(J.C.P)	○*
	Basketball		○(P.C)	○(P.C)	○(P.C.J)	○(P.C)	○(C.P.J)	○(P.C.J)	○(P.C.J)	○(P.C.J)	○(P.C.J)
	Volleyball		○(P)	○(C)	○(C.P)	○(P.C)	○(C.P.J)	○(P.C.J)	○(P.C.J)	○(C.P.J)	○(P.C.J)
Open	Track & Field	100 Yard Race	○(USA)	○(J)	○	○(P)	○(J)100m	○	○(P)	○(J)	○
		220 Yard Race	○(USA)	○(F)	○	○(P)	○	○	○(P)200m	○(P)	○
		440 Yard Race	○(USA)	○	○	○(P)	○	○	○(P)400m	○(J)	○
		880 Yard Race	○(J)	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○(J)800m	○(J)	○
		1 Mile Race	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○(J)1500m	○(J)	○
		Marathon	○(J)	○(J)25Mile	○	○	○(J)28.385	○	○	○(J)	○
		120 Yard High Hurdle R	○(USA)	○	○	○(P)	○	○	○(P)	○(J)110m	○
		220 Yard Low Hurdle R	○(USA)	○	○	○(P)	○	○	○(P)	○	○
		Broad Jump	○(USA)	○	○	○(P)	○(J)	○	○(J)	○(J)	○
		High Jump	○(USA)	○	○	○(C)	○(P)	○	○(J)	○(J)	○
		Pole Vault	○(USA)	○	○	○(F)	○	○	○(C.P.J)	○(J)	○
		Shot-put	○(USA)	○	○	○(F)	○	○	○(P)12lb	○(J)	○
		Discus	○(UK)	○(P)	○	○	○(P)18lb	○	○(J)	○(J)	○
		Hammer Throw	○(UK)	○(USA)	○	○(F)	○(J)19lb	○	○	○(J)	○
		Half Mile Relay	○(J)	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○	○
		2 Mile Race	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		1 Mile Relay	○	○	○	○(P)	○	○	○	○	○
		10 Mile Short Marathon	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○	○
		5000m Race	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○(J)	○
		400m Relay	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○
		3000m Medley	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○
		3000m Walk	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○
		Standing Broad Jump	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○
		Standing High Jump	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○
		10000m Race	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○
		Triple Jump	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○
		Javelin	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○	○
		5000m Walk	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		400m Hurdle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
	(Women)	100m Race	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		200m Race	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		800m Race	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		80m Hurdle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		400m Relay	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		High Jump	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		Broad Jump	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		Shot-put	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		Discus	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
		Javelin	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○(J)	○
	Bicycle	5 Mile	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		15 Mile	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		Pursuit	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		2 Mile	○	○	○(J)	○	○	○	○	○	○
	Swimming	50 Yard Freestyle	?	○	○	○(F)	○(F)50m	○	○(P)	○(J)	○
		100 Yard Freestyle	○	○	○	○(F)	○(J)100m	○	○(P)	○	○
		440 Yard Freestyle	○	○	○	○(F)	○(J)400m	○	○	○	○
		880 Yard Freestyle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		1 Mile Freestyle	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		100 Yard Backstroke	○	○	○	○(P)	○(J)100m	○	○(P)	○	○
		220 Yard Breaststroke	○	○	○	○(P)	○(J)200m	○	○(P)	○	○
		200 Yard Relay	○	○	○	○(P)	○(J)200m	○	○	○	○
		800m Relay	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		Diving	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○
		(Sonneboard)	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○	○

Philippine Islands donated most trophies for the FECG. W. Forbes Cameron, the governor general of the Philippine Islands, donated a silver cup for the track and field in 1913; the Army and Navy Club, Manila Club, and University Club jointly presented a silver cup for swimming; Teodoro Yangco, ex-commissioner of Philippines, gave a silver cup for the tennis singles; Mr. Antonio R. Roxas gifted a silver cup for the modified marathon; Sergio Osmena donated a silver cup for basketball; A.G. Spalding donated a silver cup for volleyball; and William M. Sloane, Allison V. Armor, and Evert J. Wendell, members of the IOC, jointly presented a gold wreath for the general championship. According to the three-wins rules adopted in 1923, to the Philippine Islands a golden wreath and three silver cups for the track and field, swimming, and basketball; to Japan two silver cups for tennis singles and the modified marathon; and to China a silver cup for volleyball were awarded permanently. The revision of the rule of trophies in 1923 might reflect the shift of power from American or YMCA leadership in the FECG to Japan's expansive and hegemonic ambition to seize Asia as a whole. The trophy for the general championship, the highest honorable symbol in the FECG, changed from a

National flags also caused diplomatic problems. After the Ninth Games in Tokyo in 1930, the British Olympic Association, finding that “Indian competitors in the Far Eastern Olympic Games at Tokyo insisted on adopting the Nationalist Flag instead of the recognised flag for India” claimed to the IOC that “some restriction be placed on the use of sectional or non-recognised flags by competing teams at the Games, which are held under the auspices of the International Committee.”³⁹ Responding to this claim, the IOC asked the Indian Olympic Association and the Japan Amateur Athletic Association to investigate the controversy over the flag. G.D. Sondhi, the secretary of the Indian Olympic Association, sent his reply to the

Table 3. Challenge Trophies (1913-1930)

		(Tabled by I.A.)									
Trophies and Cups		Presenters	1913	1915	1917	1919	1921	1923	1925	1927	1930
I. Permanent Cups and Trophies			Manila	Shanghai	Tokyo	Manila	Shanghai	Osaka	Manila	Shanghai	Tokyo
General Championship Silver Cup	Emperor of Japan(J)							Japan	Philippine	Japan	Japan
Track & Field Athletics Silver Cup	Leonard Wood(G.G.of Philippine)(P)							Japan	Philippine	Japan	Japan
All Around Track & Field Trophy	Chian Kai-shek(President of China)(C)										Japan
Baseball Silver Cup	M.L. Quezon(President of Philippine)								Philippine	Japan	Japan
Lawn Tennis Trophy	Prince Higashi Kuni(J)										Japan
II. Three Leg Trophies											
Track Athletics	Ryozo Hiranuma(President of JNAAF)(J)										Japan
Association Football	Y.S. Shi(C)									China	C&K(tie)
Volleyball	Osaka Amateur Athletic Association(J)							Philippine	Philippine	China	China
Baseball	C.T. Wang(Minister of Foreign Affairs)(C)										Philippine
Basketball	Seiichi Kishi(President of FEAA)										Philippine
Decathlon	Ramon J. Fernandez(P)							Japan	Japan	Japan	Japan
800m Relay	M.D. Wang(C)									Philippine	Japan
100m Swim	I. Suehiro(President of JNASFX)(J)										Japan
400m Swim	Japan Advertiser(J)										Japan
1500m Swim	Baron Koyata Iwasaki(J)										Japan
100m Back Stroke	Osaka Mainichi & Tokyo Nichi Nichi (J)										Japan
200m Breast Stroke	Osaka Asahi & Tokyo Asahi(J)										Japan
100m Run	Prof. T. Yamamoto(J)										Japan
200m Run	Osaka Mainichi & Tokyo Nichi Nichi (J)										Japan
400m Run	F.O. England(Hon. Secretary of FEAA)(P)								Philippine	Philippine	Japan
800m Run	Zien Young-Ming(C)									Japan	Japan
1500m Run	Zenjiro Yasuda(J)										Japan
10,000m Run	Baron Hachiroemon Mitsu(J)										Japan
110m Hurdle	Marshal Feng Yu-Hsiang(C)									Philippine	Philippine
200m Hurdle	Teodoro R. Yangco(Ex-Commissioner)(F)								Philippine	Japan	Philippine
High Jump	Administrative Board of Education(C)									Philippine	Philippine
Pole Vault	Tomas Earnshaw(P)								Philippine	Japan	Japan
Broad Jump	T.V. Soong(C)									Japan	Japan
Hop, Step & Jump	Commissioner Quo Tai-Chi(C)									Japan	Japan
Shot Put	Seiichi Kishi(President of FEAA)										Japan
Discus Throw	Osachi Hamaguchi(Premier of Japan)(J)										Japan
III. Three Leg Trophies(Retired at the Ninth Championship Games)											
Swimming	Seiichi Kishi, L.L.D. (J)						Philippine	Japan	Japan	Philippine	Japan*
Lawn Tennis	Count Yasuya Uchida(J)							Japan	Japan	China	Japan*
Lawn Tennis-Doubles	Manuel L. Quezon(P)					Philippine	Philippine	Japan	Japan	China	Japan*
Lawn Tennis-Singles	Baron Kichizaemon Sumitomo(J)							Japan	Japan	China	Japan*
Pentathlon	Osaka Electric Light Co.(J)							Japan	Japan	China	Japan*
One Mile(1600m) Relay	Rentaro Matsu(M. of Home Affairs)(J)							Japan	China	Japan	Japan*
Swimming Relay	Eikichi Kamada(M. of Education)(J)							Japan	Japan	Philippine	Japan*
Javelin Throw	Takiji Kawamura(Manchurian Railway)(J)							Japan	Japan	Philippine	Japan*
	Chiyoda Mutual Life Insurance(J)							Japan	Japan	Philippine	Japan*
IV. Three Leg Trophies(Retired Previous to the Ninth Championship Games)											
General Championship Trophy	W.M. Sloane, A.V. Armour, E.J. Wendell, (American members of IOC)		Philippine	China	Japan	Philippine	Philippine				
Track & Field Athletics Trophy	W. Cameron Forbes(G.G. of Philippine, President of PAAF)		Philippine	Philippine	Philippine	Philippine	Philippine				
Swimming Cup	Army and Navy Club, Manila Club, University Club (P)		Philippine	China	Japan	Philippine	Philippine*				
Lawn Tennis Cup	Mr. Teodoro Yangco, Ex-Commissioner, Philippine Islands		Philippine	Japan	Japan	Japan*	Philippine				
Volleyball Cup	A.G. Spalding(A)		Philippine	China	China	Philippine	China*				
Basketball Cup	Sergio Osmena(Speaker of the Philippine Assembly)(P)		Philippine	Philippine	Philippine	Philippine	China (Philippine*)				
Basketball Trophy	Baron Heitaro Fujita, MP.(J)							Philippine	Philippine	Philippine	
Association Football Cup	The Commercial Press, Shanghai (C)							China	China	China*	
Association Football Trophy	Chin Yun Peng(Premier of China)(C)							China	China	China*	
Baseball Trophy	The Shanghai Commercial and Savings Bank (C)							Philippine	Philippine	Philippine	
Baseball Trophy	Osaka Mainichi newspaper(J)								Philippine		
Decathlon Trophy	Yuan Shi Kai(President of China)			Philippine	Japan	China	Philippine	Philippine*			
Pentathlon	Li Yuen Hung(Vice President of China)			China	Japan	China	China*				
No Special Event(The Best Chinese Athlete)	The Commercial Press, Shanghai (C)								China*		
No Special Event(The Best Chinese Team)	The Commercial Press, Shanghai (C)								China*		
Modified Marathon Cup	Antonio R. Romas(P)		Japan	Japan	Japan	Japan*					
Five Mile(1000m) Run Cup	Jigoro Kano MP(President of JAAA)(J)						Japan	Japan	Philippine	Japan*	
880 Yard (800m) Relay Trophy	Shiro Ikegami(Mayor of Osaka)(J)								Japan*		
Championship in Throwing Events	Osaka Mainichi newspaper(J)								Japan*		
100 Yard(100m) Run Cup	Nisaburo Izumi(Chairman Osaka Municipal Assembly)(J)								Philippine	Philippine	
One Mile(1500m) Run Trophy	Osaka Asahi newspaper(J)								Japan	Japan	Japan*
Tennis Ladies' Singles Silver Cup	Mrs. Shiro Ikegami(Wife of the Mayor of Osaka)(J)								Japan*		
Tennis Ladies' Doubles Silver Cups	Mrs. Shiro Ikegami(Wife of the Mayor of Osaka)(J)								Japan*		
Tennis Ladies' Singles Silver Cup	Tokyo and Osaka Jiji Shimpo(Current News)(Japan)								Japan*		
Tennis Ladies' Doubles Silver Cups	Tokyo and Osaka Jiji Shimpo(Current News)(Japan)								Japan*		
Rugby Football(the first annual Rugby Union Football Championship of Japan)	Ginnosuke Tanaka(President of the Japan Amateur Rugby Union)								(Keio Univ.)*		

*The trophies and cups permanently awarded

**Lost in the fire following the Great Earthquake of 1923

(The Sixth Championship Games, Osaka, Official Report Edited Drawn by F.H. Brown, Published by

The Japan Contest Committee, Far Eastern Athletic Association, Pp.183-184.)

(The Ninth Far Eastern Championship Games, Tokyo, 1930, Official Report, Edited by F.H. Brown, Published by

The Japan Contest Committee, Far Eastern Athletic Association, Pp.217-222.)

BOA, along with a report from the manager of the Indian team, in which he informed: "These allegations are entirely without foundation." He also reported that:

All this dispute took place with reference to the *Nihon Seinen Kan* where the team resided, but all over the stadium, swimming pool, basketball arena, baseball diamond and other decorations, the official flag of India was used. The official flag was also used by the team during the march past at the opening of the games, and also at the international meet at Osaka.⁴⁰

Dr. Kishi, president of the JAAA, sent a report to secretary of the IOC, in which he explained:

I regret to find that the British Olympic Association has been misinformed about the question of the Indian flag on the occasion of the IX Far Eastern Championship Games...By the above explanation you may understand that every precaution has been taken by the unanimous agreement of our association, Indian delegate, our foreign office and the British Embassy here.⁴¹

In this case, the BOA, instead of the British government, is seen attempting to use an international sports organization in order to put out the small flame of the Indian nationalist movement during the Games outside its empire. The British watching had certainly extended to the FECG.

The Termination: Dissolution of the FEAA and the Reconciliatory Intervention of IOC

Manchukuo's Participation in the FECG: Issues and Disputes

In the four years between the Ninth Games in Tokyo and the Tenth Games in Manila began a catastrophic process for the Far Eastern Championship Games. Japan, which has had national concessions in South Manchuria, became aggressive to China. With this friction as the backdrop, Japan sent her military forces and seized Mukden on the nights of September 18 and 19, 1931, alleging that the Chinese had blown up part of the track of the South Manchuria railway near the city. In the next few

weeks, the Japanese army occupied other cities in Manchuria and annihilated Chang Hsueh-Liang's power in the north of the Great Wall. On February 18, 1932, Japan succeeded in creating a new state called Manchukuo, and declared its independence under its head P'u Yi, the last Manchu Emperor of China. However, the commission's report made by Lord Lytton in autumn 1932 proposed a procedure for settling the dispute in such a way that China could preserve its sovereignty. On February 24, 1933, because the assembly of the League of Nations took action against Japan, Japan announced its resignation from the league. The serial problems accompanying Manchukuo had an immense political impact on the FECG. The Games became a political arena, as well as a political tool, to acquire international recognition for Manchukuo.

In April 1932, the Manchukuo Amateur Athletic Association (MAAA) was founded.⁴² Soon after it was founded, the MAAA tried to make an entry in the Tenth Olympic Games at Los Angeles. The Los Angeles Organizing Committee for the Tenth Olympic Games (LaOlympic) sent a telegram to the MAAA on May 23, stating that (1) there should be a National Olympic Committee in the country, (2) charter purposes officers should be sent to the IOC as well as to LaOlympic, (3), the national flag and the national anthem of the country should be sent to both organizations, and (4) an officer should be nominated to sign the entry form. Replying to these requests, the MAAA sent its constitution, a list of the officers to be sent to the organization, and its national flag and national anthem. MAAA sent a telegram to the IOC on June 11, 1932, stating that "Manchukuo NOC desirous to join International Olympic Movement sincerely wishes to participate in the Los Angeles Games,"⁴³ but the answer was simply "Sorry, impossible to accept your participation at Los Angeles before official recognition." Baillet Latour, president of the IOC, also sent a telegram to LaOlympic, informing: "Impossible to allow Manchuria to take part in the Games before official recognition stop it might lead to international complications I have informed Manchuria."⁴⁴ It was hardly possible for the newborn

MAAA to take part in the LaOlympic from the beginning; moreover, it did not send any officers to the IOC and LaOlympic.

Meanwhile, Cheng-Hsio-Hsu, president of the MAAA, informed the JAAA on May 3, 1933, about its intention to participate in the FECG. The JAAA welcomed this request and recommended the MAAA to apply for its entry to the Philippine Organizing Committee for the Tenth Games. On May 16, JAAA also demanded the invitation of Manchukuo to the committee. This claim was put to a tripartite vote, and rejected on September 7, according to the Article III in the constitution of the FEAA.⁴⁵ The Philippines and Japan were in favor of the Manchurian membership, but China was not. The JAAA held a meeting on November 7 to discuss the matter with the MAAA, in which both associations confirmed that the JAAA should not withdraw from the FEAA, and considering China's strong rejection to the Manchurian membership, the JAAA would seek an alternative plan for Manchukuo to participate in the Open International Games, which might be organized by the PAAF.⁴⁶

However, MAAA changed its attitude. The association sent a telegram to the JAAA on February 10, 1934, and strongly demanded its official membership in the FEAA. On February 14, the JAAA held a joint meeting with the MAAA and achieved the following agreements:

- (1) To demand an explanation of the Chinese rejection of Manchurian membership and to examine the reason for her absence from the meeting that was expected to be held in January, (2) to demand that China and the Philippines immediately hold a tripartite committee, (3) to ask the Ministry of Foreign Affairs in Japan to ask the Chinese Government about the reason for rejecting the Manchurian membership.⁴⁷

Soon after the joint meeting, some of the member of the *Manshu-Rikujokyogi-Kakusinrenmei* (Manchurian Reformist League of Athletics), which was a newly founded body of the Japanese in Manchukuo under the leadership of Heita Okabe, came to Tokyo and agitated fiercely for the political

solution for the problem of Manchurian membership. This reformist idea prevailed over the attitudes and opinions of the MAAA. On March 2, 1934, a meeting of the representatives of the JAAA, MAAA, and the Manchurian Reformist League was held. They unanimously agreed that the Chinese rejection was "unfair from the view point of sportsmanship."⁴⁸ However, the position of JAAA and MAAA were slightly different in terms of the significance of "sport." Whereas the JAAA clung on to the purity and nonpolitical aspect of sport, the MAAA insisted on the political usage of sport. The Manchurian membership question, according to MAAA, was not a genuine problem of sport but of politics, and its solution was to be sought through politics. The MAAA suggested, or rather emphasized, that the withdrawal of the JAAA from the FEAA could be an effective or the sole solution for this problem. On the other hand, JAAA still expected "international faith in the sports world," or, in other words, "sportsman's agreement."⁴⁹ The JAAA and the MAAA failed to resolve this problem, but the JAAA decided to send a representative, Tadaoki Yamamoto, to China and the Philippines to lobby for Manchurian membership. Dr. Yamamoto arrived in Shanghai on March 12, but it was just one day before his arrival that the China National Amateur Athletic Federation (CNAAF) had decided not to approve Manchukuo's membership to the FEAA. Although he met Dr. Chengting T Wang, president of the CNAAF and a member of the IOC, Dr. Yamamoto could do nothing but leave for Manila. He had a meeting with the PAAF and came to an agreement that it would have a special conference of the FEAA at Shanghai in April. The special conference was held on April 9 and 10 at the New Stadium Office in Shanghai.⁵⁰ In the afternoon session on April 9, the issue of Manchukuo's entry was discussed on an informal basis. Dr. Yamamoto pointed out that "the question of Manchukuo's entry in the Tenth Far Eastern Games is on the basis of participation and not of membership (for the moment) on the same basis that India was invited to participate in Japan in 1930... The question of inviting Manchukuo to participate does not require a unanimous vote but

could be carried by a majority vote.” On the other hand, Mr. Sung contended, and as the minutes put it,

China could not consider the question of Manchukuo’s entry, holding to Articles III and X of the Constitution.... China did not agree to Japan’s view and there seemed to be a difference of opinion over the question of whether or not the participation of a country requires a unanimous vote or whether a mere majority would do, and suggested that this should be referred to the next Congress.

Dr. Tan mentioned: “The Philippines would welcome any new members but in sending her invitation to Manchukuo it was with the definite understanding that it should conform with Articles III and X, as required by the Constitution.”⁵¹ The conference reached an impasse. The next morning, however, the following possible solutions were suggested:

(1) Refer the question of Manchukuo’s participation to the next congress. (2) Refer the matter at once to the executive committee, as provided for by Article XIV of the Constitution. (3) Following Japan’s line of argument (majority vote only required for participation); refer the matter at once to the Philippines for a definite vote on the question of Manchukuo’s participation.⁵²

The conference was adjourned at 11:30 a.m., with the following summary by Dr. Tan:

In view of the irreconcilable stands of Japan and China, incompleteness of the minutes on the India case, thus causing a divergence of opinion between China and Japan, the Philippine delegate decides not to vote now on the Manchukuo participation, leaving the final decision of any present members entirely in their own hands, repeating the information that the Philippines has already gone very far in her preparation for the Games, expecting naturally to receive the usual cooperation as has been given in the past to other hostess nations.⁵³

The resolution agreed to in the special conference disappointed Dr. Yamamoto, because when he had visited Manila he had thought that he had been able

to get the Philippines’ favor in this matter. After he returned home, he wrote to Jorge B. Vargas, the second vice-president of the FEAA, and received the following reply:

Thus far, regarding the Far Eastern Championship Games the Philippines have never been influenced by any factors except pure sportsman spirit. We have not been involved in the international issues regarding Manchukuo; we voted for the Manchukuo participation with a sincere hope to establish good sportsmanship among the Far Eastern countries. We will welcome Manchukuo participation to the Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games, if the present constitution allows.... If Japan requests to revise the present constitution in the next congress, we will consider it favorably with the spirit of sportsmanship and friendship.⁵⁴

In the meantime, the JAAA wrote to the MAAA to have the presence of mind in proceeding with the matter, and to have faith in efforts by the JAAA to achieve Manchurian participation.⁵⁵ MAAA, at that moment, was very critical toward the JAAA’s attitude, because it has no solutions. The MAAA and the Manchurian Reformist League of Athletics, in cooperation with Japan’s rightist groups, had been demanding JAAA’s immediate withdrawal and reorganization of the FEAA. On April 16, the MAAA, under the name of *Kokusaikyogi junbi iinkai Tokyo iinkai* (the Preparatory Committee for the International Games, Tokyo Committee), sent a protest note to the JAAA, in which the Tokyo Committee strongly criticized JAAA’s participation in the FECG. The protest reached such an extent that the Tokyo Committee sent a letter to the JAAA breaking off relationships:

Provided JAAA is lead by the present officers, we declare to break off hereafter our relationship with JAAA for the following reasons: (1) We do not recognize JAAA’s sincere faith in the Manchurian participation question....(3) We acknowledge that the indecisive attitude of JAAA cannot stop bringing serious damage and having ill effect on the close relationship between Japan and

Manchukuo. (4) We are convinced that the management of officers of JAAA goes inevitably against the hopes of athletes who believe in the pure spirit of the sportsman.⁵⁶

The JAAA held a meeting on April 17 to discuss the question with those who criticized the JAAA and were sympathetic to the MAAA, but the meeting was called off because of the sympathizers' absence. The MAAA published on the same date, a leaflet entitled "*Nihon Senshu Shokun ni Tsuguru Sho*" ("To Japanese Athletes"), and tried to hinder the JAAA from sending athletes to the FECG. Besides this, the MAAA took various actions that mobilized persons in the government, political parties, the navy, the army and rightist organizations. On April 24, a pressure group organized by such people came to the JAAA to meet its officers and handed to them a protest note which stated that sending athletes to the Games at Manila would not only endorse the Lytton report but also profane the great achievements of tutelary deities enshrined in the Yasukuni-Shrine, as well as the mission of "*sport-do*" (the way of sport, or sportsmanship) and "*sport-teki tachiba*" (the stand of sport, or sportsmanship).⁵⁷ The JAAA refuted this protest note saying that since the Manchurian participation to the FECG could be approved only by unanimous votes of the tripartite countries, the association must, as the last resort, revise the constitution at the Congress of the Tenth Games at Manila. The JAAA also alleged that the association had been trying to resolve this difficult question with "*sport-do*," "honesty of sportsman spirit," and "the oriental fraternity and amity."⁵⁸ In the send-off party for the athletes on April 24, the JAAA issued a statement alleging its final resolution:

(1) According to both the constitution of FEAA and the common sense and hopes of the athletes, the decision was made to send the Japanese team to the Tenth Games in Manila, (2) The association has been emphasizing the sportsmanlike attitude that a thing should be judged by its essence as well as with one's broader mind, (3) Manchukuo's participation to FECG should be resolved lawfully by the

constitution at the general congress of FEAA, (4) Holding Manchukuo's participation in high regard, JAAA will realize it decisively, and will appeal the higher ideal of FEAA and the spirit of sports, which these three countries have followed with cooperation for years. (5) If the cordiality and the allegation of JAAA were neglected or rejected, there should be no way for JAAA to abide by the justice that will direct the dissolution of FEAA.⁵⁹

The Japanese team left the port of Kobe on April 28. Next morning on the ship, Taku Iwahara, an officer of the JAAA, read a notification on behalf of the Minister of Education, in which two objectives were clearly outlined: "The Far Eastern Championship Games this time have two objectives, one is to tread on the path of righteous international games, and the other is to realize Manchukuo's participation to the Games as early as possible."⁶⁰ Here, sport inseparably combined with politics. Politicians, even officers of the JAAA, exploited the discourse of sport, "sportsmanship," as an indispensable rhetoric for political and diplomatic efficacy.

Dissolution of the FEAA and the End of FECG: The Intervention of IOC's Sportsmanlike Politics

As an advance party, Ikkaku Matsuzawa and Kitaro Abe left for Manila via Shanghai on April 23. They met on the ship, Honorable Manuel L. Quezon a president of the FEAA, and reached a private consensus that Manchukuo's participation in the FECG would not be rejected.⁶¹ The General Congress was held on March 19 and 20.⁶² Hon. Quezon and Dr. C.T. Wang, first vice-president, were not present. The topics discussed in the Congress were (1) general program of the meet, (2) official interpretation of the constitution, (3) official recognition of the finalists in track and field and in swimming, (4) disposition of the Emperor's Cup, (5) amendments of by-law, and (6) inclusion of boxing in the FEAA official program.⁶³ Apart from the second point, all reached a consensus after the discussions of each special committee. On the suggestion of Mr. Sung, the discussion of the second

point was deferred and sent to the constitution committee. However, the committee had not reached a consensus by the next day. De las Alas, of the Philippines was obliged to present an oral report instead of the written one. After he construed Article III literally as "in order that a new member be admitted, a unanimous vote of all present members is required," he reported with perplexity as follows:

Japan proposes that admission of memberships be voted upon favorably only by two-third of the members to be present in a given Congress or unanimous vote of the Executive Committee.... But after so long a time discussing and deliberating the matter with open-mindedness, I regret to state that the members of the Committee have not been able to come to a definite conclusion. Each member of the Committee had an opinion of his own.... I may state briefly, however, that the representative of China was absolutely against any amendments to the Constitution. He contended that this part of the Constitution has been in force for many years and that so far the association has been running smoothly and has been living happily. On the other hand, the representative of Japan insisted on the proposition or proposal of submitting it to the Congress, contending that we ought to have more members in the association and that we would probably be happier if we had more members in the association. He stated further that the purpose of the association is to foster the development of athletics and that this work of the association should be extended not only to the present members of the association but to the others who may seek admission into the association.⁶⁴

In this impasse, De las Alas proposed a clever alternative to the amendment of Article III, in which he suggested that "in amending Article 10, only that article relative to participation in the games themselves be amended so that without being a regular member, a country may participate in the games if admitted participation in the games by the countries composing the association."⁶⁵

Meanwhile, Mr. Ho of China alleged:

We view that China does not see the Japanese point of view of asking an amendment of Article 3 in the Constitution. Of course, the Japanese delegates state that by amending Article 3, we would have a chance to cope more places as newcomers come in. We Chinese delegates view that this is entirely out of question because the spirit of the Far Eastern Athletic Association as far as ten years ago had really provided a unanimous consent of those countries and for the last 20 years we did not have any trouble whatsoever about the constitution.... Very recently we admitted two new members: Netherlands Indies and French Indo-China. They came to our organization without difficulty. This shows that Article 3 of the Constitution in a way did not hinder the progress of our association.⁶⁶

Japan contended:

We, the Japan Amateur Athletic Association, have always been referring to the wholesome development of sports in the Far East and bringing the Japanese above the world standard with the same spirit manifested by Manuel L. Quezon in the reception given to us, and from this viewpoint, as is presented, the different Far Eastern athletic associations are a portion of this body. This holding of the Far Eastern Championship Games every four years for the mutual development of the sports in the Far East and then naturally the participating nations to this association will be increasing year after year until there are many participants and members of the association. As a matter of fact, now we have besides China, Philippines, and Japan French Indo-China and Netherlands Indies and I think from this very same spirit all the members of the association should be guided. From this point of view, when it concerns of membership, I think there should be no restrictive rules; we have to leave our door open. The only condition which we must be careful about and take into consideration when taking in a new application for membership is that whether that new applicant has a supposed

governing association. That is the point. There is no political or nationalistic sentiment.⁶⁷

Whereas Japan aimed to amend Article III and to revise the constitution according to Article XIV, China decisively was against both the amendment and revision. There was no room for compromise. The problem was no longer sportsman's agreement but the political judgment that had been already taken by the government. Mr. Sung, the Chinese delegate, told: "This question brought by Japanese friends is vital to Japan and is very vital to China."⁶⁸ After the proposal of De las Alas had been seriously discussed, the focus of the discussion moved to the interpretation of Article XIV. Mr. Sung alleged:

I have been informed that an official invitation has been extended to both French Indo-China and the Netherlands Indies that they have become members. It would be most unfair to the new members as well as to ourselves once we have made a promise to say that for the time being we will let you as members. I think it is most unfortunate on that point whether today we have the necessary representatives here to change the constitution according to Article 14. Article 9 refers to meetings, but on Article 9-B the majority should carry in ordinary meetings certain business which does not touch the fundamental points. But under Article 14, the constitution may be amended at the regular meeting of the assembly by a two-third vote of the members represented. We have five members. A two-third membership not four. It is different from Article 9. I think we are acting most unconstitutional to pass anything which is the fundamental basis of the constitution today.⁶⁹

He also proposed that this case should be appealed to the IOC:

I am not a lawyer but I believe my interpretation of the Constitution as I stated is correct. It is a contract; it is a party agreement. It is better to refer this matter to a higher body, the World Olympic Committee, and brought up again for final decision at the next regular meeting.⁷⁰

However, Dr. Sison and Hon. Vargas of

Philippines disagreed with Mr. Sung's interpretation. Hon. Vargas explained as follows:

If there are four representatives in this Congress, two-thirds would mean three votes because you can not split one vote. If there are three countries, two-thirds means two votes. So there is quite difference between the ordinary majority rule under Article 9 and the two-third vote required for amendment in Article 14. In other words, if there were four countries represented on the question of amendment, it would require three votes to carry it; five countries would require four votes; it would require three votes to pass the ordinary resolution. In other words, we have practically three distinct classes of the case: the first is the admission of members, which requires everybody's vote; the second is the amendment of the constitution, two-third vote—if there are five, two-third means four; and the ordinary resolutions, which require a majority.⁷¹

China's point, however, was not in it. Mr. Hoh of China remarked that the crux of the matter was in the interpretation of the phrase *two-thirds members represented*: "The interpretation of the constitution (Article 14) is very clear: two-third vote of members represented; that is, two-third among us of the organization." China again claimed that this case should be brought to some authority or legal body to make a definite interpretation of it. As a result Dr. Sison made the motion that "the constitution may be amended in a regular meeting by two-third vote of the members represented not by two-third vote of all members."⁷²

The motion, however, caused China's "official" withdrawal from the congress. The remark made by Dr. Sung before leaving the hall was:

This does not mean that we are withdrawing from the Far Eastern Athletic Association. It is our firm contention that the action which you are going to take is most unconstitutional....

As I said, on this particular point China prefers to be officially out of the meeting.⁷³

There left the Philippines' was embarrassment and Japanese ambition in the hall.

China's "official withdrawal" was one of the scenarios Japan had foreseen from the beginning. Soon after the Chinese delegates left the hall, Mr. Abe proposed the foundation of a new association:

I regret to see the Chinese leaving this congress and I am sorry of their non-cooperative attitude. Since they left the congress, although it does not mean withdrawal from the Far Eastern Athletic Association, the members remaining must understand it to mean almost withdrawing from the Far Eastern Athletic Association. Thereby Japan proposes, if it is agreeable to the Philippines, to dissolve the Far Eastern Association and immediately put a new and better association so that no such conflict will happen in the future. In that new association we willingly recommend China, if she wants, to come and in that new association Netherlands Indies and French Indo-China and other countries will have the right of participation.⁷⁴

However, Japan and the Philippines had to have another meeting for the official dissolution of the FEAA and the foundation of a new association.

On May 21, with the consent of the Philippines, Japan claimed the meeting according to Article V of the Constitution.⁷⁵ China, of course, disagreed to be present. Japan persuaded the Philippines and reached an agreement to dissolve the FEAA. Regio R. Ylanan, honorary secretary of the committee of organization for the Tenth Games in Manila, was to inform this dissolution to the IOC. In this meeting, the following mutual agreements between the Philippines and Japan were made:

(1) The new association shall be named "The Amateur Athletic Association of Orient" (AAAO) and its Games "The Oriental Championship Games." (2) The Constitution of AAAO shall be all the same as FEAA, except, regarding the new membership, to replace "unanimous vote of the countries comprising the association" in Article 3 with "a two-thirds vote of the countries comprising the association." (3) The Philippines and Japan will approve Manchukuo's membership to AAAO, provided that MAAA officially applies. (4) The Oriental countries will be

persuaded to join AAAO, (5) The first Championship Games will take place in Tokyo in 1938, and the second at Manila in 1942. (6) The first meeting will be held in Tokyo in October 1934, and to conclude the protocol regarding the new constitution and the new by-laws of the Championship Games. (7) Mr. Abe and Mr. Ylanan will be appointed officers of the Special Committee of Constitution and Organization, (8) The honorary secretary of AAAO shall publicize the announcement of the foundation of AAAO and its officers. (9) The invitation to the First Oriental Championship Games shall be extended to the countries in the Orient at large. (10) The officials of AAAO: honorary president, Hon. Manuel L. Quezon; president, Ryoza Hiranuma; vice-president, Hon. Jorge B. Vargas; honorary secretary, Takashi Go.⁷⁶

Meanwhile, Chengting T. Wang, president of the CNAAF, and William Z.L. Sung, honorary secretary, wrote a letter to Count de Baillet-Latour, president of the IOC, in which they reported the details of the congress in Manila. In the last part of the report they claimed that that FECG had not yet been dissolved, and asked for further patronage of the IOC:

After a lengthy discussion on the interpretation of Article 14, it was evident that no decision could be reached. China suggested referring this matter to the International Olympic Committee, to which Japan strongly objected. The Philippino Chairman then arbitrarily ruled that he was satisfied with the "two-thirds" meaning two-thirds vote of members present in the assembly and not two-thirds vote of the members of the association and was ready to put it to vote. The Chinese delegates withdrew from the meeting as a protest to the unconstitutional act. Please also note that Japan and Philippines amended Article 10 but not Article 3 after China left the hall. The next day Japan and the Philippines took it upon themselves to dissolve the Far Eastern Athletic Association. This act was most unconstitutional. It might be within the rights of Japan and the Philippines to

withdraw from the membership, but certainly not to dissolve the association....It is China's intention to hold the Eleventh Far Eastern Championship Games in Shanghai in 1938.⁷⁷

Count de Baillet-Latour replied deliberately but rather politically:

I am writing to you unofficially, because the position of the International Committee is very special in this matter. You are absolutely independent from the committee and it is only on account of the good influence of the FE Games in the Orient that the IOC has given them its patronage. We are, however, always prepared to do all what is possible to smooth every difficulty, if possible. Some time before the Tenth Games were due to take place I heard that Indo-China had not been made a member, because Japan had refused to vote for that country by reprisal, because China had refused to admit Manchukuo. Dr. Kishi died few days ago. At a loss to know who had taken his place I wrote to Dr. Kano and made it quite clear to him that in our opinion, it was a very great mistake to mix sport and politics and that there was no excuse to refuse French Indo-China, if China was refusing Manchukuo. I heard since that Japan had altered its point of view. For the same reason I ask you today if it would not be possible to follow the same course and to make China admit Manchukuo. We believe that the intercourse of sportsmen of the different countries is the best way to make men of the different countries understand each other and to help to solve the other problems.⁷⁸

China was probably embarrassed at his proposition, which was based on the "political" impartiality of sportsmen. C.T. Wang, who was certainly a politician and a diplomat, criticized Baillet-Latour's view of Manchukuo:

...but [I] feel that the situation vis-à-vis Manchukuo is not correctly understood. Indo-China was of different status from Manchukuo when she was annexed by France. Her people were still and still are of a different stock from the Chinese and her status as a nation was more

or less of that of a vassal. Moreover, China agreed to the new arrangement. On the other hand Manchuria, known as the Three Eastern Provinces, has been part and parcel of the Chinese Republic and her population is entirely Chinese. Japan's seizure of the provinces has been vigorously contested by the Chinese government and people, and the world through the League of Nations still considers it as a part of China. Under such circumstances it is impossible for our National Amateur Athletic Federation to give our approval to admit the so-called Manchukuo as a member of the Far Eastern Athletic Association. We consider it most preposterous on the part of the Japanese Athletic Association to have Manchukuo admitted into the FEAA.⁷⁹

The first meeting of the AAAO was held at Tokyo on December 14, the minutes of which were sent to Baillet-Latour by Takashi Go, honorary secretary of the association. In his letter, he appealed the validity of the new association and asked for IOC patronage:

As a result of the rapid development of sport activities in the Far East, the Far East Athletic Association, which was devoting itself for the development of sports in the Orient in the spirit of Olympism during the past twenty years, is confronted with the acute necessity of reforming its organization to a bigger and stronger body. It was realized at the Congress of the FEAA in Manila on May 20, 1934, where the old Far Eastern Athletic Association was dissolved and the new Amateur Athletic Association of the Orient was decided to be formed....Now, my dear Count, I have the honour to assure you that the Amateur Athletic Association of the Orient will in the future do its best to add more glorious pages in the history of the FEAA, especially for the enhancement of the Olympism in the Orient under the wings of your Committee, and I take this opportunity to express my sincere hope that you and your colleagues in the IOC will favour the AAAO with same patronage as you did to the FEAA in the past.⁸⁰

At this meeting, the following resolutions and agreements were made: (1) The amendments of the Articles III and XIV of the old constitution as discussed and approved by the congress of the FEAA in Manila to be adapted to the constitution of the AAAO. (2) In Article X, following the word *nationals* in both places, there should be added the phrase *or subjects*. (3) Modifications of by-laws to be left for the next meeting. (4) The first Games to be held in Tokyo in 1938, and the second at Manila in 1942. (5) All countries in the Orient, including China, to join and be represented in the association. A definite invitation to be extended to India, Siam, Persia, Dutch-Indies, French Indo-China, Burma, Turkey, Afghanistan, and the Federated Malay States. (6) The new foundation of the AAAO to be notified to the IOC. (7) The second congress to be held in Tokyo in April or early May.⁸¹ With regard to AAAO's claim for IOC's approval, Count Baillet-Latour answered,

I am sorry to say that this question cannot be answered for the present. The IOC has been greatly concerned by all the reports at hand in regard with the dissolution of the FEAA and all what happened at the Congress in Manila on May 20, 1934.⁸²

Count Baillet-Latour seemed to know further the relationship between the FEAA and AAAO. In his letter dated July 25 advising the Philippine Amateur Athletic Federation to appoint its representatives in the IOC, he tried to confirm which association was officially recognized and existing. In reply, Regino R. Ylanan, secretary and treasurer of the PAAF, wrote:

In connection with your reference to the Far Eastern Athletic Association, there seems to be some misunderstanding on your part as to what happened in Manila during the Games in 1934. The association was dissolved on the refusal of China to continue attending the general assembly when a vote, adverse to her views, on the proper interpretation on certain provisions of FEAA constitution was taken. Not wishing to drop these Far Eastern Games altogether, another association was created, which China

and other Oriental countries have been invited to join. Irrespective of this incident, however, the athletic relations between China and the Philippines continue to be very cordial, to the extent that we have tentatively agreed to take part in an international meeting to be held in Shanghai in 1938.⁸³

In this letter, Ylanan endorsed the official resolution of the FEAA in Manila on the one hand, and on the other suggested the existence of a tentative agreement with China on the Philippines' participation at an international meeting in Shanghai in 1938. This was very confusing, complicated, and beyond understanding, but it was probably diplomacy. Different information from different sources must have confused the president of the IOC. However, Baillet-Latour reached a conclusion:

After having been looking into the whole proceedings and the report of Hon. Jorge B. Vargas, I came to the conclusion, reading between the lines, that the real reason of the trouble was China's objection to Manchukuo. The only thing to do then was to create a new association, where every country could be admitted by a two-third vote of the countries comprising the association. But my opinion is that now it is our duty to do our best to get China to reconsider the matter and to join the AAAO. No better opportunity should we have than the next Olympic Games and I expect that the IOC ought to invite all the countries of the Far East including China to meet next year in Berlin during the Games as we did in Amsterdam in 1928.⁸⁴

Even if his conclusion were deduced from sportsmanlike impartiality, and even though he was president of the IOC, it would never have been accepted according to the standards of contemporary international politics. Sportsmanlike impartiality is needed to control politics; by the same token, it seems that politics sometimes is needed to control the judgment of sportsman.

Conclusion: Historical Significance of FECG

This study can be summarized as follows. (1) The

creations of the Far Eastern Olympic Association (Far Eastern Athletic Association) and the Far Eastern Olympic Games (Far Eastern Championship Games) were the products of American strategies deployed by her colonialism in the Far East since Spanish-American War (1898). In cooperation with the strategies, E.S. Brown, a physical director of the YMCA, played a great role to initiate "all sports for all" policy in the Far East. Although there was a friction between E.S. Brown and Pierre de Coubertin over the usage of the word "Olympic", he was eventually successful to acquire the patronage of the IOC for the first regional games in the world that might underpin the Olympic movements in the Far East. (2) The FECG was the first regional games planned by E.S. Brown whose grand scheme included such regional games as South American International Games, Indian Empire Games, Central European Games. FECG was the successful model for the subsequent regional games to be organized by the partnership between the YMCA and the IOC. (3) The countries and regions involved in the FECG were far beyond the "Far East", which reached more than the fifteen such as Japan (Taiwan, Korea, Manchoukuo), China, Philippine Islands under American regime, Siam, British India, Ceylon, French Indies, Dutch Java. (4) Sending Japanese athletes to the FECG gave a strong impetus for the reorganization of the JAAA. A series of confrontations of sending athletes between the JAAA and respective sports governing bodies brought the modernization of amateur sports regime in Japan. (5) The main championships constituting the FECG were non-Olympic sports like baseball, basketball, and volleyball. This constitution shows the strong influence of the YMCA. As track and field events show, however, the rules of this sport were gradually reformed in accordance with the international rules by a series of assertions from the JAAA. Sports performed in the FECG amounted to more than fifteen sports, which were seven championship sports like track and field, swimming, baseball, tennis, association football, basketball, and volleyball, and eight open championship sports like bicycling, rugby, table tennis, soft tennis, hockey, boxing,

gymnastic, and shooting. The sports like track and field, swimming, tennis, soft tennis, basketball and volleyball were provided for female athletes, but only as the open events or exhibitions. The amendments of rules, in general, reflected the national interest of the respective countries. (6) The trophies donated to the FECG were the symbols of the authority of IOC, of the ambitious rule over Asian countries by Japanese Emperor system, of political powers of politicians, of the media powers of newspaper industries, and of the economic power of entrepreneurs in the tripartite countries. Facing the dissolution of the FEAA, the return of the Emperor Cup to Japan became serious concern of the JAAA. The usage of nationalist flags by the Indian athletes during the Ninth FECG in Tokyo caused the diplomatic problem between the British Olympic Association, the JAAA and the IOC. This dispute shows that sports organizations could proceed a kind of war by proxies on the political issue. (7) Soon after the Japanese creation of a puppet country, Manchoukuo, the Manchoukuo Amateur Athletic Association was founded under the Japanese leadership in April 1932, and made an entry for the Tenth Olympic Games in Los Angeles. It also applied its membership to IOC, but both requests were rejected due to the nonrecognition of Manchoukuo in the international affairs. (8) The MAAA mobilized the rightists in Japan to implement sending delegates to the Tenth FECG in Manila, 1934. Despite both the MAAA and the JAAA adopted "non-political" discourses of "sportsmanship" and "sportsmanlike faith" in order to realize Manchoukuo's participation to the Games, they never achieved an agreement of procedures for the realization. Whereas the MAAA claimed the immediate dissolution of the FEAA, the JAAA was insisted in the formal procedure in order to resolve the question during the Congress of FEAA. (9) Japan brought a motion that the Article Three in the Constitution concerning the admission of "membership" which required unanimous votes among members should be amended, but the result of the motion was China's "official" withdrawal from the Congress. China did not admit their secession from

the FEAA. (10) Soon after the China's withdrawal the JAAA and the PAAF agreed to found a new association, the Amateur Athletic Association of the Orient. (11) Confirming China's withdrawal from the FEAA according to the information of the PAAF, Count de Baillet-Latour wrote the JAAA that he would hold a meeting on the occasion of the Berlin Olympic Games in 1936, and would, with "sportsmanlike impartiality", persuade China to involve in the new organization, the AAAO. However, in reality, there never occurred the Games organized by the AAAO as well as the further FECG from thence.

The Far Eastern Championship Games was a product of peacekeeping, or rather hegemonic strategy, deployed by American colonialism in the Far East. E.S. Brown's initiative certainly played an important role in creating the Games, but the political function of the regional Games was to maintain the power balance of the region. Having said this, it is, however, improper to reduce his initiative to such political discourse. As a physical director of the YMCA, apart from having an immediate concern about politics, he devoted himself to the implementation of the ideal of "All Sports for All," which could be shared with Olympism. In the early stages, the FECG played a vital role in stimulating the modernization of sports among the nations of the Orient. Of course, this is one side of the coin. The enthusiasm to modernize sport might have brought about a feeling of repugnance for old-fashioned and traditional sports, or, conversely, it might have aroused their antipathy to conspicuity of modern sports. However, it can be pointed out that at least the conformity to idealism or ideology shown in phrases such as *peace and harmony of the world could be achieved through sports*, and *sportsmanship guarantees human self-improvement* spread swiftly to the Asian countries. Spreading this idealism among the nationalistic Asian countries in the age of imperialism was expected to contribute to peacekeeping and mutual understanding. The conformity to "sportsmanship," which became a cliché in these countries, shows the extent and power of the prevailing ideology. The globalization

of sport in the age of imperialism could be symbolized by the hegemony of sportsmanship. The individual athletes who took part in the FECG seemed to have behaved as sportsmen and to have believed in the high ideal of sportsmanship, although this contention needs to be verified in future research.

The ideal of sportsmanship, however, did not function as people had expected. In an international arena filled with nationalism, chauvinism, and imperialism, it became an instrument of politics and diplomacy. Sportsmanship seemed like the ideological tool and the means to bring about political and diplomatic efficacy. It became torn between being a phrase of ideological idealism and an expedient phrase of politics. The FECG, which had aimed to achieve an ideal of sportsmanship and peaceful communication in the Far East through sport, became an arena of politics. Participation in the Games, choice of sports and events, and the regulation of the sports rules were employed as tools to sustain nationalism. Trophies and flags were exploited as symbols that of nationalism and dignity of each nation. Both the idealism of the YMCA and internationalism of the IOC failed eventually to control the nationalism and national interest of Asian countries. In face of the Manchukuo problem, YMCA's active involvement in the FECG was frustrated, and the IOC became a mediating organization of sportsmanlike politicians. The FECG became a tragic story in the history of sport and politics.

Is it, however, sufficient to conclude this paper with an emphasis on the incompetence of idealism—sportsmanship? Is it not worthwhile confirming to the idealism or ideology of sportsmanship; or, if you like, fair play? How can we evaluate the worth of sport? I maintain that the idealism of sport can still point us in the right direction, provided we hold a sincere dialogue regarding the intrinsic value of sport and the possibility of its implementation. An ideal can be actualized through one's conformity and practice—that is idealism. By the same token, the idealism of sportsmanship might lead politics, as well as improve sportsmen's behavior. It is a fact that FECG had the limited function in terms of the

solution of the international political disputes, but it is also true that it conveyed among Asian countries a commonsense that sport could bring pacifism and sportsmanship as an ideal of character building. The historical significance of the FECG, therefore, is complex.

(The author should like to express his sincere gratitude for the generous co-operation from the members of IOC Research Council and the staffs of IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne. Without their help this paper could not have appeared in the Bulletin.)

Notes and References

- ¹ *Official Report: The Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games*, Japan Amateur Athletic Association, 1934, p.2.
- ² William Howard Taft was appointed the first governor general of Philippines, and later became the twenty-sixth president (1909-1913) of the United States. His successor, Luke E. Wright, who had been a member of the Philippine Commission, became the first American to bear the title of Governor General and served from 1904 to 1906. The governor generals up to 1921 were Henry C. Ide (1906), James F. Smith (1906-1909), W.C. Forbes (1909-1913), and Francis B. Harrison (1913-1921).
- ³ Johnson, L. Elmer. *The History of YMCA Physical Education*. Association Press, 1979, pp. 160-161.
- ⁴ Bocobo-Olivar, Celia. *History of Physical Education in the Philippines*, University of the Philippines Press, 1972, p.55. The first officers of the Philippine Amateur Athletic Federation were Governor-General William Cameron Forbes, president; President Murray Butler of the University of Philippines, first vice-president; Leonard D. Dyson, second vice-president, and Elwood Stanley Brown of the YMCA, secretary-treasurer. The objectives of the PAAF were to (1) encourage systematic physical exercise and education; (2) promote and improve athletic sports among amateurs; (3) establish and maintain a uniform test of amateur sanding and uniform rules for the government of all athletic sports; (4) institute, regulate, and award amateur athletic championships; (5) incorporate all eligible athletic organizations into membership in the federation and to promote the interests of these organizations; (6) affiliate by alliance with organizations of general or special jurisdiction, composed of units wholly or partly devoted athletics; and (7) encourage and promote the establishment of public playgrounds and recreational facilities.
- ⁵ *Official Report of the Sixth Championship Games of the Far Eastern Athletic Association held in Osaka, May 21-26, 1923, under the Patronage of His Imperial Highness Prince Chichibu, and by the Sanction of the International Olympic Committee*. Report drawn up by Franklin H. Brown and published by the Japanese Contest Committee and the M. Takase Chairman Publicity Committee, March 1924, p.1. (Franklin H. Brown quoted this sentence from William Tutherly's booklet entitled *The World at Play* published in 1920.) The same eulogy is also dedicated to E.S. Brown by the *Official Report of the Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games*, p. 2; "In 1910, there were many professional boxers in the McKinley fortress, who wanted to participate in the basketball league. In order to distinguish professionals from amateurs, for a start, Philippine Amateur Basket Ball League was organized, and then PAAF was founded in December by receiving the request from the governing bodies since November. E. Brown's dedication to the organization, who came to the Philippines in the same year as a physical director, was enormously profound."
- ⁶ Dainihon Taiikukyokai. *Dainihon Taiikukyokai-shi* [History of the Japan Amateur Athletic Association], Vol. 1, Meguro-shoten, Tokyo, 1936, pp. 737-738.
- ⁷ Tutherly, William. *The World at Play*, 1920, quoted by F.H. Brown in the Sixth Championship Games of the Far Eastern Athletic Association held in Osaka.
- ⁸ *Dainihon Taiikukyokai-shi*, op. cit., Vol.1, p.738.
- ⁹ Brent, C.H. Letter to Pierre de Coubertin, September 30, 1914. PAAF File, Historical

Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne. "Our international work (Far Eastern Athletic Association) has been equally encouraging....If our work here proves successful in leaguering together the athletics of Far Eastern Nations, it will give the International Olympic Committee a splendid chance to gather into its fellowship the whole Orient as a unit. I feel that we who have lived here for long years have an understanding of Orientals and an opportunity of reaching them, which men living in the West could not hope to have. Our part will be to federate the various national units into the larger unit of an international association and develop this latter so that it will be easy and natural for you to ally it with your great Western international organization."

¹⁰ *Official Report of the Sixth Championship Games of the Far Eastern Athletic Association*, op. cit., p.7.

¹¹ The three American IOC members at this time were William M. Sloane, Allison V. Armour, and Evert J. Wendell.

¹² Johnson, E.L., op. cit., p.162.

¹³ Coubertin, Pierre de. Letter to E.S. Brown, January 25, 1919, and the letter from E.S. Brown to Pierre de Coubertin, February 3, 1919. YMCA File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

¹⁴ Brown, E.S. Letter to Baron de Couertin, January 2, 1920. YMCA File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

¹⁵ Brown, E.S. Letter to Baron de Couertin, February 2, 1920. YMCA File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne. In this letter he wrote, "Mr.Thutherly and I had a most satisfactory conference today with Professor Sloane, related to the proposal that the International Olympic Committee recognize and assume a paternal supervisory interest in the Far Eastern Games, the proposed South American International Games and Indian Empire Games. Needless to say we found him not only sympathetic to the idea, but keen to see it to a successful conclusion. We discussed the question at length from all angles in the thorough way I need not tell you that Professor

Sloane handles such propositions. His last statement was that he would be prepared at the Antwerp meeting to speak as an advocate of the plan. Professor Sloane expects to see his American Colleagues, Messrs. Armour and Weeks, at once and if necessary will arrange a second conference on the subject with these two gentlemen present. If I correctly interpret his attitude, however, I think he feels he will find both of them heartily in favour of the plan and as senior member of the American Olympic Committee he is the proper person to bring it to their attention. I am hoping he will find time to write to you direct."

¹⁶ E.S. Brown, Address to the International Olympic Committee, Antwerp, Belgium, 1920. YMCA File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

¹⁷ E.S. Brown, Letter to Baron Pierre de Coubertin, November 10, 1920. YMCA File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

¹⁸ E.S. Brown, Letter to Baron Pierre de Coubertin, June 1, 1921. YMCA File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

¹⁹ Twenty-nine nations were represented at the Olympic Games at Antwerp in 1920.

²⁰ Buchanan, Ian. Elwood S. Brown: Missionary Extraordinary. *Journal of Olympic History*, Fall 1998, pp.12-13. "Just when it seemed that a positive and meaningful arrangement between IOC and YMCA might be achieved Elwood Brown suddenly died just three weeks before his 41st birthday."

²¹ *Official Report of the Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games*, op. cit, pp. 5-6.

²² Ibid., p.6.

²³ Ibid., p.7. PAAF appealed to JAAA to change the dates for the Games from October to May, and it was granted.

²⁴ Ibid., p.7.

²⁵ Kano, Jigoro. Letter to de Coubertin, November 17, 1921. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

²⁶ Kano, Jigoro. Letter to de Coubertin, August 1,

1921. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne. Dr. Kano spoke of the relationship between the IOC and FEAA as follows: "In course of my remarks, I explained the action taken at the Antwerp meeting last summer regarding giving official recognition to the Far Eastern Athletic Association and similar developmental agencies in other part of the world. A few questions were asked regarding the nature of the relations involved, as some of the men were at first evidently apprehensive of some administrative entanglements, but it was made clear that the relationship proposed was not organic but fraternal. Gratification was expressed at the recognition received and I was asked to extend the cordial greetings of the Far Eastern Athletic Association to the International Olympic Committee, and to assure that body of hearty cooperation. I made a few suggestions, among them the following: (1) The metric system be adopted. 2. As far as possible the events in two series of games be identical. 3. All countries in the Far East take part in the Olympic Games."

²⁷ Brown, E.S. Letter to de Coubertin, January 13, 1922. YMCA File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne. After receiving the letter from Dr. Kano, De Coubertin instantly wrote to E.S. Brown to verify what had happened with Jigoro Kano in Shanghai. E.S. Brown replied to the question in a letter dated January 13, 1922: "The fact that Dr. C.T. Wang of China is now a member of the IOC, and a colleague of Kano, will still further safeguard the recurrence of the difficulty at Shanghai since Wang and Kano will no doubt have occasion to see each other or get in communication in the immediate future. This should help establish a better understanding all around."

²⁸ According to Dr. Wang's letter to Baron de Coubertin, he was serving for the diplomacy toward Russia at the directorate-general of the Sino-Russian negotiations. Letter to Baron de Coubertin, April 7, 1924, China National Amateur Athletic Federation File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

²⁹ *Dainihon Taiiku Kyokai-shi*, Vol. 1, op. cit., p.756.

³⁰ *Official Report of the Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games*, op. cit., p.4.

³¹ Brown, E.S. Letter to Baron de Coubertin, March 10, 1916. YMCA File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

³² *Official Report of the Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games*, op. cit., p.5.

³³ *Ibid.*, p. 7. See also Kano's letter to Baron de Coubertin, November 17, 1921. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, p. 9.

³⁵ *Ibid.*, p. 11.

³⁶ *Ibid.*, p. 12.

³⁷ The Philippines sent an athlete for the first time to the Eighth Olympic Games in Paris, 1924, and her larger delegation was sent to the Ninth Olympic Games in Amsterdam in 1928. China sent her athletes to the Tenth Olympic Games in Los Angeles in 1932.

³⁸ *Official Report of the Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games*, op. cit., p. 310. In the resolution of the Trophies Committee in 1923, Clause 3 was "that unless otherwise specified all trophies become the permanent property of the controlling athletic organization of the country which wins same three times, not necessarily in succession, and that this rule becomes retroactive," and Clause 5 was "that a certain limited number of trophies be given special prestige through never being awarded permanently. That is, these trophies are not to be disposed of on the basis of three wins, but remain in the permanent possession of the Far Eastern Athletic Association. In the event of the Far Eastern Athletic Association going entirely out of existence such permanent trophies shall return to the country originally offering same." (*Official Report of the Sixth Far Eastern Championship Games*, op. cit., p. 161.)

³⁹ Hunter, Evan A. Letter from the secretary of the British Olympic Association to the secretary of IOC, July 15, 1930. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

- ⁴⁰ Sondhi, G.D. Letter from the secretary of the Indian Olympic Association to the secretary of the British Olympic Association, August 11, 1930. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.
- ⁴¹ Kishi, Seiichi. Letter from the president of Japan Amateur Association to A. Berdez, secretary of the IOC, September 8, 1930. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne
- ⁴² According the constitution of the MAAA, the main aims were as follows: "The association is organized to develop all wholesome athletic activities in the state, to encourage systematic physical culture and education, to establish the standards of competitions recognized by the amateur world at large, to stimulate national spirit and to promote international goodwill. In order to attain the objectives as set forth above, the association shall engage in the following works: (1) Hold an annual athletic meeting in commemoration of the foundation of the state, (2) Participate in the International Olympic Games and in the Far Eastern Championship Games, (3) Conduct championship contests of amateur sports in the state, (4) Undertake recreation work at large, (5) Research, study, and instruct for physical culture and education, (6) Publish newspapers, magazines and books relating to physical culture and education, (7) Establish libraries for physical culture and education, (8) Conduct any other works necessary for improvements and promotion of physical culture and education in the State." The officers of MAAA were as follows: Honorary president, His Highness The Regent of Manchukuo; president, His Excellency Mr. Cheng-Hsio-Hsu, prime minister of the state; chairman of the executive committee, His Excellency Mr. Tsang-Shi-I, minister of the Department of Civil Affairs; honorary secretary, Mr. Tetsuya Kamimura, the Bureau of Social Education, Educational Department; honorary treasurer, Mr. Techian-Tsau, he Bureau of Social Education, Educational Department. (A letter and the constitution sent by Cheng-Hsio-Hsu and Tetsuya Kamimura to IOC, June 12, 1932, Manchukuo Amateur Athletic Association File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne).
- ⁴³ Cheng-Hsio-Hsu. Telegram to Berdez, secretary general, IOC, June 11, 1932. Manchoukuo Amateur Athletic Association File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.
- ⁴⁴ Latour, Baillet. Telegrams to Manchukuo and to LAOlympic. June 12, 1932, Manchoukuo Amateur Athletic Association File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.
- ⁴⁵ Article III in the constitution of FEAA reads "A country may be formally admitted to membership and representation in the association at any time on conditions and with territorial limits as hereafter determined, but only by unanimous vote of the countries comprising the association." (*Official Report of the Ninth Far Eastern Championship Games*, Tokyo, 1930, p. 232.)
- ⁴⁶ *Official Report of the Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games*, op. cit., p. 290.
- ⁴⁷ Ibid., p. 290.
- ⁴⁸ Ibid., p. 291.
- ⁴⁹ Ibid., p. 291.
- ⁵⁰ Minutes of the Special Conference of the FEAA, April 9, 1934, Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne. Those present were Dr. Vidal A. Tan, representing the Philippine Islands; Dr. Yamamoto, Mr. Matsuzawa, and Dr. Inui, representing Japan; Dr. Y.S. Tsao and Mr. Wm. Z. Sung, representing China. In the morning of April 9, the conference passed the following resolutions: (1) Confirmation of admission of French Indo-China and Netherlands Indies. (2) Agreement to the proposal for the elimination of general championship. The disposition of the Emperor's trophy to be left to the general congress.
- ⁵¹ Ibid. Article X defines the "Basis of Competition" as follows: "(a) The Far Eastern Championship Games shall be contests between amateur nationals of the countries holding membership in the Far Eastern Athletic Association. Nationals born or living outside their own country retain the right to represent their country in competition. (b)

- An individual who has ever represented a country in any international competition is ineligible to represent any other country in the Far Eastern Championship Games. (c) All members of the association shall be held directly and fully responsible for the amateur standing and the conduct of their representatives in competition in accordance with the hereinafter stated definition of amateur.” (*Official Report of the Ninth Far Eastern Championship Games*, op. cit., p.232.)
- ⁵² Minutes of the Special Conference of the FEAA, April 10, 1934. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.
- ⁵³ Ibid.
- ⁵⁴ *Official Report of the Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games*. op. cit., p. 298. Ikuo Abe translated the letter quoted in the report.
- ⁵⁵ Ibid., p. 299.
- ⁵⁶ Ibid., p. 302.
- ⁵⁷ *Dainihon Taiiku Kyokai-Shi*, Vol.1, op. cit., p. 589. In this context, “deities” mean mainly the soldiers fallen in the battles since the Meiji era.
- ⁵⁸ *Official Report of the Tenth Far Eastern Championship Games*, Op. cit., pp. 304-305.
- ⁵⁹ Ibid., pp. 304-305.
- ⁶⁰ Ibid., p. 306.
- ⁶¹ *Dainihon Taiiku Kyokai-Shi*, op. cit., p. 594.
- ⁶² Participants were as follows: Officers of the FEAA; Jorge B. Vargas (second vice-president); Ryozyo Hiramuna (honorary president); Regino R. Ylanan (honorary secretary); Chinese delegates: Willam. Z.L. Sung, Gunson Hoh, John Mo, and four associates; Japanese delegates: Ikkaku Matsuzawa, Kitaro Abe, Toshimitsu Shibuya, and fourteen associates; Philippines’ delegates: Antonio de las Alas, Victor Buencamino, Antonio G. Sison, and seven associates; Netherlands Indies’ representatives: Dr. F.J. Brand and three others, were present as observers, to which they agreed.
- ⁶³ Minutes of the meeting of the congress of the Far Eastern Athletic Association, held in the Philippine Columbian Club House, Manila, May 19, 1934. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.
- ⁶⁴ Minutes of the meeting of the congress of the Far Eastern Athletic Association, held in the Philippine Columbian Club House, Manila, May 19, 1934, p. 5. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.
- ⁶⁵ Ibid., p.7.
- ⁶⁶ Ibid., p.7.
- ⁶⁷ Ibid., p.8.
- ⁶⁸ Ibid., p.10.
- ⁶⁹ Ibid., p.11.
- ⁷⁰ Ibid., p.11.
- ⁷¹ Ibid., p.12.
- ⁷² Ibid., p.15.
- ⁷³ Ibid., p.16.
- ⁷⁴ Ibid., p.16.
- ⁷⁵ *Dainihon Taiiku Kyokai-Shi*, Vol.1, op. cit., p.599. Article V reads: “(a) The officers of the association shall be an honorary president, a president, one or more vice-presidents and an honorary secretary. (b) The officers shall be elected at the regular meeting of the assembly, to hold office until the following meeting, or until their successors are elected. Should any office become vacant between regular meetings, the country represented in such office shall appoint a successor and shall notify the honorary secretary of such an appointment. (c) The duties of the officers shall be those usually performed by such officers. The honorary secretary shall conduct correspondence, keep minutes of all meetings, and shall transmit all records of every description to his successor.”
- ⁷⁶ Ibid., pp. 599-600.
- ⁷⁷ C.T. Wang & Wm.Z.L. Sung. Letter to Baillet-Latour, July 28. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.
- ⁷⁸ Count de Baillet Latour. Letter to Chengtung T. Wang, August 29, 1934, Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.
- ⁷⁹ C.T. Wang. Letter to Count de Baillet Latour, October 23, 1934. Far Eastern Championship

Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

⁸⁰ Go, Takashi. Letter to Count de Baillet Latour, February 9, 1935. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

⁸¹ Amateur Athletic Association of the Orient. Minutes of the First Congress Tokyo, Japan, December 14, 1934, pp.1-5. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum

in Lausanne.

⁸² Count de Baillet-Latour. Letter to Mr. T. Go, March 22, 1935. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.

⁸³ Ylanan, Regino R.

⁸⁴ Count de Baillet-Latour. Letter to Dr. Regino R. Ylanan, October 29, 1935. Far Eastern Championship Games File, Historical Archives, IOC Olympic Museum in Lausanne.